DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 770 LI 003 041

AUTHOR	Durkin, Robert E., Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of the Conference on Federal Information Resources (2nd, Washington, D.C., March 30-31, 1971).
SPONS AGENCY	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.; Federal Council for Science and Technology, Washington, D.C. Committee on Scientific and Technical Information.; Federal Library Committee, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 71
NOTE	107p.; (0 References)
AVAILABLE FROM	Federal City College Press, Media Services Div., Federal City College, Washington, D.C. 20001 ($4.25)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Community, Conferences, Federal Programs, *Feedback, *Government Libraries, *Information Needs, Information Services, Information Utilization, Library Services, *Research Libraries, *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS	*Committee on Scientific and Technical Information, COSATI, Federal Library Committee

ABSTRACT

The second conference on Federal Information Resources continued the discussion, begun in 1970, between the Federal library and information community and the research library community. Although each had its particular mission and problems, there is agreement that some problems are common to the two groups and that, in at least some instances, the one community can assist the other to the benefit of both. There was a review of progress made in attacking some of the issues identified at the first Conference, and a report on services recently established or about to be established. Moving beyond specific problems, there was an effort to consider and appraise proposed new organizations, management devices and services that might enable the Federal and non-Federal communities to provide improved services to their users. The special needs of the predominatly black institutions were presented in detail and means of bringing about improvements were set forth. A series of discussion groups provided the opportunity for exchange of views on topics of current interest to both groups. The all-embracing Conference Resolution directed the sponsors to attempt to carry out the recommendations and considerations presented by the speakers, discussion leaders and other participants. (The first Conference is available as ED 043 792) (Author/NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED053770

PROCEEDINGS
of the
SECOND CONFERENCE
on

FEDERAL INFORMATION RESOURCES

WASHINGTON, D.C.
MARCH 30-31, 1971

Sponsored by:

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
COSATI PANEL ON LIBRARY PROGRAMS
THE FEDERAL LIBRARY COMMITTEE
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

LI 003 041

FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE PRESS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1971

Any material in this document may be freely reproduced; acknowledgement of the source and credit are requested.

Published and distributed by
FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE PRESS

Media Services Division
Federal City College
Washington, D. C. 20001

Edited by Robert E. Durkin

SEPTEMBER 1971

Introduction

The second Conference on Federal Information Resources continued the discussion, begun in 1970, between the Federal library and information community and the research library community. Although each has its particular mission and problems, there is agreement that some problems are common to the two groups and that, in at least some instances, the one community can assist the other to the benefit of both. At the very least, mutual understanding of problems and limitations should contribute to mutual forbearance.

Thus there was a review of progress made in attacking some of the issues identified at the first Conference, and there was a report on services recently established or about to be established. Moving beyond specific problems, there was an effort to consider and appraise proposed new organizations, management devices and services that might enable the Federal and non-Federal communities to provide improved services to their users. The special needs of the predominantly black institutions were presented in detail and means of bringing about improvements were set forth.

A series of discussion groups provided the opportunity for exchange of views on topics of current interest to both groups. Out of these groups came a long list of recommended actions.

The all-embracing Conference Resolution directed the sponsors to attempt to carry out the recommendations and considerations presented by the speakers, discussion leaders and other participants. The Conference concluded with the determination that a concerted effort would be made to work toward solutions of some of the more urgent problems.

Selection of the date of the next Conference was referred to the sponsors.

Stephen A. McCarthy
Chairman

July 30, 1971

Federal Information Resources

Proceedings of the Second Conference
March 30–31, 1971

Table of Contents

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1971

Page

If Only the Cherry Blossoms Were in Bloom! (Conference Welcome and Opening Remarks) *Andrew A. Aines* 1

Federal Progress on the First Conference Recommendations. *Marion A. Milczewski* 2

New Federal Programs, Products, and Services *John Sherrod* 8

Panel on Negro Research Libraries
- *Jean-Anne South* (moderator) 17
- *Frank Kurt Cylke* 22
- *Annette Pinazee* 25
- *John P. McDonald* 28

Research Libraries and the Information Community (Conference Discussion Paper) *Neal Harlow* 35

Conference Discussion Paper Reactor Panel
- *Thomas R. Buckman* (moderator) 40
- *Neal Harlow* 40
- *Philip J. McNiff* 43
- *Martin M. Cummings* 45
- *William T. Knox* 46
- *William S. Dix* 49

Content Coordination or Chaos (Conference Banquet Address) *Burton W. Adkinson* 60

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1971

Reports of the Discussion and Working Group Sessions Priorities of the First Conference Recommendations *Gustave A. Harrer* 64

Most Essential Common Needs of Research and Federal Libraries *Warren J. Haas* 67

Reciprocal Assistance Between Federal and Non-Federal Research Libraries and Information Agencies *Maryan Reynolds* 69

(continued)

Table of Contents continued

Legislation Needed by the Research Library and Information Fields *J. Donald Thomas* 71

Establishing Authority for National Actions and Standards *Frank L. Schick* 73

Wanted: New Management Concepts for Inter-Library Cooperation *Bernard M. Fry* 76

Prospects as Viewed by the Sponsoring Groups
  COSATI Panel on Library Programs
  John Sherrod 85
  Federal Library Committee *F. Kurt Cylke* 86
  Association of Research Libraries *Stephen A. McCarthy* 87

Plenary Session 90

If Only the Cherry Blossoms Were in Bloom!

ANDREW A. AINES
Office of Science and Technology

I commend the sponsors and planners of this Conference for their hard and creative work in arranging this meeting. You are coming to Washington at a good time of the year, but it would be better if only the cherry blossoms were in bloom. I sincerely hope you will find the weather benign and this Conference stimulating and exciting.

You can play an important part in making the Conference vibrant by refusing to remain politely passive. There were a few fireworks last year; I hope that some of you have brought a few firecrackers with you for this one. Ask questions; get things off your chest; and make your presence felt. Remember that this is Spring; the sap is beginning to flow.

A word to the sponsors. I think your idea of making this a joint conference is a good omen for the future; I am genuinely pleased. I consider the effort of the COSATI Task Group on Library Programs so promising that I am pleased to announce that we have made it into a full-fledged Panel. With this new Spring finery, this new status, I know that it will be a magnet for many of the most important people in the library and information worlds.

We all recognize that we are going through some lean times. I wish it were otherwise, but it ought to be a period when we can think hard and with a degree of insight. I hope this will come out during the meetings, even if the cherry blossoms do not. There is a tremendous era ahead of us, one in which automation and networking will come to the library world—but not without labor pains. It will be tough to get money, but I do not think that funds will be far behind when we come up with meritorious programs that will bring visible gains in efficiency, not to mention economy of operation. The computer, the microform, the photocopier, the communications satellite, are as much tools for us as for any other segment of our knowledge-handling world. We must and will use them. Like everything else on this frantic, phrenetic planet, the world of the knowledge-tenders is going through a transition. Where and how we wind up will depend on you—every one of you—individually and jointly.

We have been waiting for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science to come into being. Do not despair. There are a couple of us who keep the pressure on, trying to get action. I am hopeful that it will happen in just a few weeks. Do not expect too much from the Commission, especially as it gears up for action. Remember that it is a Commission. It can recommend. It can urge. It cannot order. It has to build an image and a reputation. These will help it accomplish the goals we cherish.

Your program promises a stimulating two days, and I venture to say you will soon forget that the cherry blossoms are not yet with us. Join in. Participate. Do have a good conference.

Federal Progress on the First Conference Recommendations

MARION A. MILCZEWSKI
University of Washington

The program lists this presentation as an assessment of progress made by the Federal library community on the First Conference recommendations. Since that conference provided limited opportunity for formal recommendations by the group I re-read the presentations made by members of the non-governmental sector and by representatives of the Federal library community, looking for specific or implied recommendations. Furthermore, I have taken into account promises and plans of the reporting agencies. Based on such a review I have attempted to state what appears to have happened since last March. I have not tabulated the specific or implied recommendations or made a checklist. However, I have at least listed, and in some instances commented on, those developments that are most visible to me and which respond to the recommendations, real or implied. Perhaps it is appropriate that I speak now since I was the only spokesman for that fictional and short lived organization, the Coalition of Affected Libraries in the Non-Governmental Sector (COALINGS), which was born out of a sleepless period early one morning after the first day of the conference, and which dissolved into thin air at about 4:00 p.m. the afternoon of the same day when exposed to view and reason at the conclusion of our first conference.

Assessment was not an easy task. There is no single source of information to which one can turn, and it may be that the focusing of attention on this one lack may be the principal value of my appearance here. What I mean is that the information about what is happening in the Federal library community is dispersed, fragmentary, and incomplete. I shall say more about this later. It is only at a meeting like this that some coherent view can be had, with representatives of the coordinating agencies reporting on developments, plans, and hopes.

I should preface what follows by saying that none of the items listed below refers to any specifically identified recommendation, but individually and collectively they do respond to hopes for action expressed in the several papers and in the comments. Also, the list is incomplete, but it shows much to give us hope that we may be getting someplace together.

Accomplishments

1. This Second Conference is an indication that the Federal library community and the non-Federal research library community wish to continue talking to one another for their mutual benefit.
2. The invitation to the Executive Director of ARL, Dr. Stephen McCarthy, to become a guest observer on the Federal Library Committee was extended and, happily, was accepted. Mr. Cylke announced his intention to do this last year during the final plenary session.

3. Two publications emerged during the year to provide a wealth of information concerning the "hidden" resources of the Federal library community. The first was in draft form at the time of our last conference and was described at that time by Mrs. Elsa Freeman of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Library and a member of the Federal Library Committee Task Force on Acquisition of Library Materials and Correlation of Federal Library Resources which sponsored the study.

> Benton, Mildred. *A Study of Resources and Major Subject Holdings Available in U.S. Federal Libraries Maintaining Extensive or Unique Collections of Research Materials.* Final report, U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Research Project No. 8-0310. Washington, D.C., George Washington University, September 1970, 670 pages.

The second publication was compiled by some of the same project personnel who worked on the previous project. It was undertaken with the support of the Federal Library Committee and with funds provided by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Library and Information Science. It identifies over 1900 individual libraries in the Federal Government.

> *Roster of Federal Libraries*, compiled by Mildred Benton and Signe Otterson. Washington, D.C., George Washington University, October 1970.

4. The National Acquisitions and Cataloging Program was expanded to include Romania and Spain in the shared cataloging effort. Further development work resulted in the inclusion of other countries for multiple copy distribution. The number of books cataloged promptly, or relatively so, continued to rise.

5. The proposed inauguration of Cataloging in Publication Program of the Library of Congress was discussed last year by John Lorenz. It seems that funds will be provided, assuring that project of success.

6. The National Agricultural Library implemented the Cataloging and Indexing Network (CAIN) data base development project. This was described last March by John Sherrod and, according to the NAL annual report at the January 1971 ARL meeting, is now beginning to operate.

7. A New experimental service of the Lister Hill National Center for Biomedical Communications was initiated to provide rapid, responsive searching of selected English language medical literature. The service is called AIM-TWX and will be reported more fully by Mr. Sherrod in his presentation.

8. Census data on computer tapes became available during the year. A full set of these data is contained on abour 2000 reels. The Center for Research Libraries has a grant to condense the entire data bank to 300 reels and to make these high density tapes available at a relatively low cost.

9. Eleven Federal records centers have received their first shipment of National Archives Microfilm Publications. Some of the most significant records in the National Archives are reproduced on 35 mm and 16 mm microfilm. Furthermore, these include introductions and annotations to improve their usefulness (*ARL Newsletter* No. 44, Nov. 2, 1970). The availability of loan copies to the institutions in the regions served by each records center removes the necessity for research libraries to continue to purchase such microfilm copies for their own collections. At the same time, it places at close hand a vast store of resource materials for our scholars. In a sense this is a substitute for depository distribution.

10. Under special authorization by the U.S. Office of Education, Leasco Systems and Research Corporation offers for sale, magnetic tape copies of the files of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). Included are: the report resume files, containing all items announced in *Research in Education* (RIE); the journal article resume files, containing all items announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education* (CIJE); and the thesaurus file of ERIC descriptors.

11. The National Archives has developed SPINDEX II (Selective Permutation Indexing) for the automated control of archival material. Federal, private, and state-supported institutions participated in this development.

12. The *Directory of Federally Supported Information Analysis Centers* was produced for COSATI by the National Referral Center for Science and Technology at the Library of Congress.

13. U.S. Office of Education awarded a contract to Systems Development Corporation to pursue a project suggested by the Federal Library Committee. The contract provides for "an analysis of automated Federal library programs for the purpose of establishing feasibility criteria and as a basis for development of a generalized automated system design." While developed with Federal libraries in mind, it ought to be useful to research libraries at large.

14. The Department of Commerce established the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) to "simplify and increase public access to Federal publications and data files of interest to the business, scientific and technical communities." The Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information (CFSTI), in the National Bureau of Standards, has been transferred to NTIS. The range of services available through the Clearinghouse was to be enlarged as a result.

There are undoubtedly other results which are more visible to those in the Federal library establishment and perhaps to other representatives of the research libraries at this meeting; and, of course, there are the negative elements. Among the latter, these might be mentioned:

1. There is still no National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, even though there is legislation providing for it;

2. The Library of Congress has not yet been named the National Library; and,
3. The COSATI Panel on Library Programs and the Federal Library Committee do not make available, on a regular and systematic basis, the kind of information supplied at the March 1970 meeting.

There is also an old and oft-repeated complaint. We still have to depend on a wide variety of media to bring the news—The *L.C. Information Bulletin, ARL Newsletter, JOLA Technical Communications, Library Journal, College and Research Libraries, ASIS Journal,* and others that are familiar to you. The trouble is that there are so many of them. They are repetitious, up to a point, and not all of us have the time or energy to read them consistently. Furthermore, not everything reported is interpreted for its meaning and impact.

What is the answer? More direct information from COSATI Panel and the Federal Library Committee in a form useful to research library directors. Perhaps this is a task ARL should take on with the assistance of the FLC and the COSATI Panel on Library Programs. Can it be done? Research libraries, from the viewpoint of the Federal agencies do not seem to be supplying all kinds of information to users. They are still largely print oriented. Other agencies continue taking over the function of dealing with computerized stores of bibliographic and substantive information. On the University of Washington campus the only computerized stores we deal with directly are Medlars and AIM-TWX. The sad fact may be that libraries should be no more than suppliers of print, but I do not believe in that restricted definition of the library's role. Henry Dubester addressed himself briefly to this problem at the First Conference on Federal Information Resources. I see no change taking place, but not necessarily because of the lack of concern of the Federal library community. Perhaps the completion of the third phase of the efforts of the Federal Library Committee's Task Force on Automation will help. That phase had as its objective, "to develop the definitions of library functions and operations which are susceptible to automation, both those now being automated in Federal and other libraries, and those not now being automated or scheduled for automation." The result of that phase was expected to be "a manual providing guidelines of value to library staff attempting to determine the technical and economic feasibility of automating single or multiple capabilities that are, or should be, available to meet library needs. . ."

I would like to close this brief overview with a look at the money side of things. It was quite apparent that there were divergent points of view at our first meeting about who was going to pay for the products of the Federal libraries, or at least what the method of payment should be; and there was another divergence in whether research libraries were consumers or suppliers of information. The most prominent item discussed was the *Bibliography of Agriculture*. Although it did not emerge as a specific recommendation, the research libraries, by and large, want Government-produced information, bibliographic or other, distributed to libraries at little or no cost. The activities of the past few months seem to run counter to the point of view of the research libraries, and they are paying out of declining budgets. Yet, not only are the research libraries suffering, but so are Federal library community efforts, if one can judge from the library press. Of particular significance is the following item from the Library of Congress *Information Bulletin* for January 7, 1971.

> *The Panel on Research Libraries* at the October 23, 1970 meeting of the Science Information Council adopted the following resolution:
>
> The Science Information Council has taken note with deep concern of the OSIS (Office of Science Information Service) action to defer its support of certain research and developmental work related to research libraries because of severe budgetary restraints.
>
> The Council wishes to observe in this connection:
>
> 1. That the major research libraries of the country already have a critical, indeed an indispensable, role in the communication of scientific and technical knowledge;
> 2. That the role, operations, and other aspects of the research library will be an essential part of, and will be critically affected by the development of national information networks and related systems;
> 3. That both the operations and service obligations of the major research libraries are already being very seriously affected by the development of large discipline-oriented and other information systems;
> 4. That major improvements in the responsiveness of the major research libraries are urgently needed to facilitate the communication of scientific and other types of knowledge and information, and that these improvements in turn will require solutions to very complex technical, intellectual, and economic problems;
> 5. That there is a relative absence of other sources of funding for such analytical and developmental work, and, furthermore, this is a field where NSF has a very exceptional technical competence; and
> 6. That, in relation to other OSIS and NSF programs, the total level of the required funding to sustain or even expand the OSIS programs in these areas is small in relation to the size, complexity, and importance of the problem.
>
> For these reasons, the Council strongly recommends that NSF reaffirm its program for the development of prototype

research library systems designed to improve the basic response capability of the research library.

This reduction and the reduction of Federal funds for library research will put research libraries more on their own resources than they have been in many years. The sad part is that the research libraries, especially those that are publicly supported, are feeling the economic pinch. We have our own higher education earthquake fault matching the earth fault running up the West Coast. When the California Legislature was trimming budgets of institutions of higher education the shock was soon felt all the way up the coast. I do not have the specifics of what is happening in California except that the news is generally sad when library budgets are referred to. It appears likely that the publicly-supported institutions of higher education of Oregon are preparing for a five per cent decrease in their salary and wage budgets. The Washington State Legislature is currently in session, and there is "no good news" there for us in higher education. I doubt that the situation is all that much rosier in other parts of the country, but at least we are "distinguished" by a 13 per cent unemployment rate. Thus the research libraries who are looking for assistance from you in the Federal library community are even more eager that you increase your concern and your efforts and not take further steps to *decrease* your help. We may be comforted by your willingness to keep channels of communication open; but we would be happier to see signs of substantial help beyond anything you have done so far. I shall look forward to the third meeting of this group if those participants from places other than Washington, D.C. have any money in their library budgets for out-of-state travel.

New Federal Programs, Products and Services

John Sherrod
Director, National Agricultural Library

For this discussion of new Federal programs, products and services, I have decided to identify developments of the past year which, in my opinion, have the greatest real impact for the library community. The things I will describe offer promise for new and valuable programs; they also represent new problems. But, working together, we should be able to make the most of our opportunities.

If I were to single out that one event of the past year, in the Federal scheme of things, which will have the greatest total effect on library programs, I would say without hesitation that it is the new directions in Federal policy enunciated in the President's State-of-the-Union Address. Of course, libraries are not mentioned explicitly—they seldom are. However, Federal librarians recognize, and all librarians should recognize, that any new substantial Federal library program advanced during this administration will reflect the political philosophy contained in that address.

The President identified six great goals in his State-of-the-Union message. He did not ask simply for more new programs in the old framework, but to change the framework itself—to reform the entire structure of American Government so that we can make it again fully responsive to the needs and the wishes of the American people.

To quote: "If we act boldly—if we seize this moment and achieve these goals—we can close the gap between promise and performance in American Government and bring together the resources of the nation and the spirit of the people."

Our Nation's libraries appear to be a special adjunct area where the application of the tenets of the New Federalism could engender necessary reforms. In a special statement to the members of the American Library Association, October 22, 1969, President Nixon articulated his genuine interest in the growing functions of the nation's libraries. In particular he noted that, in addition to providing services to professionals engaged in research and studies, libraries also brought enjoyment to those many millions of Americans who spend part of their leisure time at the library. At the same time, the President voiced his concern for the need to improve the efficiency and communication within those library services now being offered throughout the country. Apparently, President Nixon was informed of the fact that traditional methods of interaction between library operations and the users have become obsolete in terms of handling both the increase in the number of user requests and the overabundance of printed information, because the general tone of his statement underscored the urgent need for reforms within the nation's libraries. In a very practical sense, the President was also implying that the traditional solution of increasing library personnel and constructing larger storage centers is no longer an adequate response to solving mounting library problems. The President seems convinced of the value of using modern methods for storage and retrieval purposes. In his special statement to the American Library Association, he gave his support for this area of development:

> In a world where knowledge is the key to leadership, a modern, progressive library system is a vital national asset.

As state and local initiatives in modernizing libraries gradually tend toward "localism on a national basis," it is anticipated that the Federal Government will, in cooperation with state and local officials, provide assistance to library directors in promoting the utilization of new and more efficient methods of storage and retrieval systems.

The proper use of the new technology by our nation's libraries will mean that the decade of the 1970's may be remembered in history as the beginning of the long era of *controllable* information. Such a step forward is certainly within the context of the New Federalism which the President recently characterized as the effort, ". . . to regain control of our national destiny. . ."

I have a draft copy of the new report written by Alan M. Rees, under the sponsorship of the Federal Library Committee, entitled *Interface of Technical Libraries with Other Information Systems.* This study was funded by the Army Corps of Engineers, Technical Information Support Activities (TISA). The final report will be available from the National Technical Information Service.

I would like to quote from the Rees report to provide you with an idea of the general conclusions and recommendations of the study:

> Dual networks of libraries and extra-library information programs presently exist in the Federal Government with an undetetermined duplication of effort which produces conflict and diminishes the efficiency of the total system. Little, if any, economic justification can be advanced for not resolving overlapping objectives, functions and services. The magnitude of the Federal library establishment and of the extra-library information network requires that immediate attention be given to the interface problem. There are more than 2000 Federal libraries, holding a total in excess of 35 million volumes, employing some 4000 professional librarians and 5000 technical information specialists, technicians and other supportive personnel, operating on a budget of more than $60 million per year. In addition, there are several hundred extra-library information systems reflecting the information interests of several score Federal agencies and departments.
>
> . . . It is recommended, therefore, that a joint, *ad hoc,* FLC-COSATI working group be established, representative of all major segments of the library and information communities, to

> provide to the Office of Management and Budget, information and guidelines which would be useful in the implementation of the President's Departmental Reorganization Program. In particular, such input would be relevant to the OMB Task Force on Organization and Administration.

I am happy to report that, as of this month, an *ad hoc* group has been established to advise the Office of Management and Budget on the place of Federal libraries in the President's proposed restructuring effort. Included in the group are representatives from ALA, ARL, FLC, COSATI, and other large Government information activities. It is my hope that the group will give serious attention to findings of the Rees report.

Over the past year, TISA project, which handles all DOD research in library and information science, has provided support to two other important programs. One was the $83,483 grant to Indiana University Research Center for Library Information Science (RCLIS) to do a state-of-the-art survey on all current Federal library research, and to evaluate the programs as to their objectives. The other was to the UCLA Institute of Library Research for $98,597, to conduct a study on Federal library environmental design problems.

National Serials Pilot Project

Turning now to the three national libraries, I would like to report that the Task Force of NAL, NLM and LC representatives has reviewed the National Serials Pilot Project administered by the Association of Research Libraries. They have evaluated the procedures for inputting data from the *Canadian Union List of Serials* and for obtaining a variety of printouts in the MARC serial format.

We have made progress. We have succeeded in demonstrating the technical and economic feasibility of a national serials data bank; we have field-tested the MARC serials format; we have created a base for standard serial numbers (and, perhaps, for *international* standard serial numbers). In working with the National Serials Pilot Project, the three national libraries have reached higher levels of cooperation, and they have committed themselves to continuing the National Serials Data Program as a permanent operation. Each of these libraries continues to make progress toward fulfilling its objectives.

Library of Congress Card Division

At the Library of Congress Card Division, service had improved, by the Fall of 1970, to the point where orders for cards in stock were filled in seven working days. In addition, the percentage of orders that can be filled on demand has increased since the stock control has been based on order frequency tapes generated in turn by machine-readable order slips.

As Phase II of the card distribution mechanization project becomes operational, it brings with it promises of better and faster service to a larger audience. This subsystem of the totally mechanized program is designed to print cards on demand from MARC and Recon data bases using a computer, photocomposition machine, automatic offset presses, and specially designed cutting, collating, and packaging machines.

Indications are that 50 to 55 percent of all orders received will be filled from the machineable data base upon which Phase II is built, and that this percentage will increase as the input on MARC files grows. In February, 1971, in preparation for final implementation of Phase II, the Library of Congress discontinued use of quantity formulas for ordering cards and replaced this with standard sets of 8 cards for each title ordered. Although subscribers may receive more cards than they need under this Standard Set System, the simplified billing, accounting, and card drawing procedures offset the cost of additional card stock and allow the Library of Congress to keep prices as low as possible. For the rest of this fiscal year prices will remain at 35 cents per set for orders placed by card number and 75 cents per set for orders submitted by author and title.

Now that the card distribution program is equipped to service a large quantity of demands on a more timely basis, the Card Division is faced with the problem of regaining customers that turned to other sources because of poor service in previous years. Subscriptions for the first 6 months of fiscal 1971 were 13 percent less than for the same period in fiscal 1970.

National Library of Medicine

One of NLM's outstanding accomplishments last year was the development and testing of the AIM-TWX system, which may be used to search a selected segment of the MEDLARS data base on-line. This segment is composed of citations from the last few years of the journals indexed in the *Abridged Index Medicus* (AIM). On-line access is obtained through a variety of widely available terminals, none of which imposes substantial hardware investments on the user. Either TWX or telephone lines can be utilized, depending on the terminal. The fully implemented system will have an extended data base and use normal trunk lines. It is scheduled for the coming year.

National Agricultural Library

Meanwhile, at NAL, we are actively working toward the Agricultural Sciences Information Network (ASIN), which will provide a systematic and extensive network of information sources and services to agricultural researchers within the Federal Government as well as at the landgrant institutions. In December 1970, the Agricultural Research Policy Advisory Committee established the Agricultural Sciences Information Network Committee composed of 20 Federal and State agricultural administrators, land-grant and private corporation researchers, and information and library scientists. The Committee will oversee policy decisions intended to set in motion the machinery needed to speed, coordinate, and synthesize information vital to agricultural research, extension, and education for improved services to the nation.

It is a pleasure to announce that the *Bibliography of Agriculture* will be considerably expanded for Volume 35, January-December 1971. As you undoubtedly are aware, CCM Information Corporation publishes the *Bibliography* using data taken from the CAIN system of the National Agricultural Library. The Library has been increasing the rate of additions to the data base, and, during the next year, it will be adding nearly 120,000 records for the *Bibliography*. This represents an increase of nearly 100 percent over Volume 34. *CCM's monthly service will remain at the present price of $85 yearly.* For Volume 35, 1971, this will include nearly twice the data, published in 12 monthly issues rather than the previous 11 issues.

Office of Education

When the Office of Education formed the Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology in February of 1970, it simultaneously created a new trend in cooperative efforts between the Federal Government and the educational community to improve administration of educational systems, with particular emphasis on responding to needs of those who have been least successfully served by the system; namely, the illiterate, the drop-outs, and the poor.

From its inception, the Bureau has recognized its role as one dedicated to addressing social issues which have become top national priorities. It is, therefore, committed to programs aimed at assisting the disadvantaged in our society.

As a consequence, criteria for obtaining grant funds under the Higher Education Act (HEA) and the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), have been revised to reflect new directions in USOE programs. Indeed, USOE is determined to fulfill the mandates of the HEA programs by supporting grant proposals which concentrate on the overriding themes of equalization of educational opportunity, educational reform, and service to the disadvantaged.

With these new thrusts in emphasis, it is apparent that many institutions will have to rethink their objectives and redirect programs in order to qualify for Office of Education funds. The amount of money appropriated for the three major library programs administered by USOE equalled $155,811,000 in fiscal 1971. This amount, although somewhat curtailed by the Administration, is not an insignificant sum of money. It must be recognized, therefore, that libraries do have the opportunity to make a substantial contribution by participating in programs which will further the objectives for an improved system that is more responsive to social needs.

National Technical Information Service

In September 1970 a major reorganization occurred at the Department of Commerce, out of which emerged the National Technical Information Service. This new organization has a far-reaching mission—to simplify and increase public access to Federal publications and data files of interest to the business, scientific, and technical community. NTIS has expanded its announcement and distribution services in the areas of environmental and social sciences, as well as business and economics, for documents produced both within and outside of the Commerce Department. The number of publications announced is expected to rise from fifty thousand to eighty thousand a year.

As of January 1971, a new pricing schedule was instituted by NTIS for documents containing more than 300 pages, as well as for all microfiche copies. Increased prices are due to rising production costs. Two years after date of announcement, all documents in paper copy will cost $6.00.

There have been other changes at the NTIS, such as format and title changes for many of their announcement services. These are attempts to reflect user preference and to resemble more closely other Government indexes.

You may want to consider, in your deliberations, a problem with which you are all familiar; that is, the overlapping of responsibility between the G.P.O. *Monthly Catalog* and the announcement efforts of NTIS.

Atomic Energy Commission

Funds in the amount of $600,000 have been appropriated for architectural design of a National Library of Physics and Atomic Energy to be established at Oak Ridge, Tennessee. This complex of buildings will include a National Science Conference Center, a National Library building and the National Museum of Atomic Energy. Training and educational potential of these facilities has been emphasized in the preliminary design stage. Total cost of this complex is estimated to be in the vicinity of fifteen million dollars.

National Science Foundation

Over the years the NSF has contributed large amounts of money for research. As part of NSF's funding program, the Office of Science Information Service is interested in meeting information requirements of the community which spends its research money—largely the academic community. Therefore, OSIS has become particularly concerned with the concept of university-centered information systems. In addition, NSF is interested in expanding the capacity of universities to utilize discipline-oriented tape programs which develop as by-products of professional societies. It is in this framework that a number of universities have received NSF funding in FY 71: Lehigh ($318,000); University of Washington ($105,600); University of Georgia ($216,000); Hamline ($114,700); Ohio State ($204,200); University of Pittsburgh ($99,700).

It is particularly interesting to note that in all but one of these institutions, the library is serving as the focus for operations.

Tax Reform Act of 1969

One could go on and on, but I would like to close my remarks with one little gem that is of interest to those of us who are concerned with the information explosion. As a result of the Tax Reform Act of 1969, all private foundations are required to submit an annual report to the Internal Revenue Service. Information required in these reports includes financial statements relating to securities and assets, contributions and grants made, and the identification of managers of the programs. It is estimated that there are about 40,000 private foundations which will be producing these reports annually.

In addition, the law now requires that all tax exempt organizations file an information return. These reports will include data on income, expenditures, balances, total budget, and compensation going to officers of the organization. The quantity of material resulting from these information returns will range from 200,000 to 500,000 reports annually.

All of these reports will be available for inspection by the public at either the District, Mid-Atlantic Regional, or National Offices of the Internal Revenue Service and will be available in microform. If we combine this with GPO plans to go to micropublishing, it now becomes possible for everyone to have a library the size of Harvard in a few years.

I hope that by this brief and selective overview of the events of the last year you are convinced of three things: that the Federal community has done something; that we plan to do a lot more; and that we want and need your advice and support.

DISCUSSION

CHARLES STEVENS, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology:* I would like to ask Col. Aines two questions. The first one relates to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Col. Aines said that we should "not despair" while we wait for the few people whose job it is to put pressure on those who are to announce the Commission to make the announcement. Does he need help from this group and/or others to put the pressure on those people to make that announcement? If he needs that help, in what form should it come, and from whom, and how often, and how swiftly?

AINES: The only suggestion I have is that letters should be sent to the President of the United States. I don't think that the significance and importance of this program and what the Commission can do for all of us is fully understood. Write Pennsylvania Avenue, and maybe the pressure will trickle down to those people who are moving as rapidly as automatons through treacle.

STEVENS: The second question: I wonder if I understood Col. Aines correctly. He spoke about new technology, and he specifically said, I think, that he looks for libraries, information services, and so on, to use new technology with the effect of releasing money for problems with a different focus than information problems.

My own feeling regarding this is that the use of new technology in serving information problems, will serve mainly to give better services to the users we want to serve, and not to release funds for programs of a different focus.

AINES: It seems to me that you have a two-fold function. One is to improve service. Everybody in this room knows the difficulty of achieving this kind of a goal. Capital is needed to get the automation and the networks we talked about at Airlie House just a few months ago. And as an operating, practical, pragmatic bureaucrat, I point out to you that the one message that will come through loud and clear to help this community is to point out that there will be economy of operation which, in turn, will make the overall programs, in which the libraries' information programs are embedded, more economical to operate.

I don't mean to suggest that we try to operate with less. I have the strong feeling that our efforts will, with the passage of time, cost more and more money. But I would say that, if you want to get to the people who control the purse strings, point out that it's efficiency and economy of operation that will hold promise for the future.

GUSTAVE HARRER, *University of Florida:* I was thinking along the line of this same thing. If the idea of cutting budgets or the cost of library operation, particularly on the Federal level, continues in the manner of the Census tapes or the *Bibliography of Agriculture,* by turning it over to commercial interests, this seems to be an extremely false way of saving costs.

I can say that DUALabs' first five programs worked, and there are 27 released so far. Five of them we have got working, but it isn't like reading it out of a book from the Census Bureau. We are doing selective dissemination from the *Bibliography of Agriculture* tapes at the present time, but this is costing us more than the *Bibliography of Agriculture* used to cost us. This idea of turning over costs to the library area will not work very long. We don't have the money. Some sort of pressure must be brought to bear on the Federal sources turning out the information.

LEE BURCHINAL, *Office of Education:* Just one observation—I don't think we can write off the private sector entirely as an efficient and low-cost way of delivering services. I speak from a different position than you as consumers, but I would just cite one instance in which, when everything else is going higher, you will be able to buy ERIC microfiche on standing orders at 20% less than you could last year because we use this competitive mechanism of getting private production and distribution of those microfiche. Last year the standing order price was 11 cents per fiche. The current contract calls for 8.9 cents per fiche. This will represent a substantial reduction for those who are buying all of the ERIC microfiche.

Panel on Negro Research Libraries

Panel Moderator:

JEAN-ANNE SOUTH
OE Fellow, U. S. Office of Education

Panel Members:

F. KURT CYLKE
Executive Secretary, Federal Library Committee

ANNETTE PHINAZEE
Dean, School of Library Science,
North Carolina School of Library Science,
North Carolina Central University

JOHN P. McDONALD
Librarian, University of Connecticut
President-Elect, Association of Research Libraries

JEAN-ANNE SOUTH

> There are but 15 traditionally black colleges which have graduate Programs leading to the M.A. in a discipline other than Education, and but one, Howard University, which routinely grants the Ph.D. The rest of the colleges are undergraduate, and though many give graduate degrees in teacher education, most are not qualified to compete for the larger, mission-oriented and science centered Federal programs.

The previous statement was taken from the report of the Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Education, *Federal Agencies and Black Colleges, Fiscal Year 1969* (Revised, January 1971). This will be referred to hereafter as the FICE report.

Such is the status of black institutions in the whole field of Education that these institutions are arbitrarily called colleges when, in reality, some are universities. Also, the statement that Howard is the only Ph.D granting black institution is false. Atlanta University does have a Ph.D. program too. In fact, Atlanta University has been ignored by the majority of the data-gathering institutions, so statistics are not available for use. The predominantly black institutions and the predominantly white institutions which have been chosen for comparison were selected on the basis of four factors: first, prestige; second, graduate and post-graduate education offered; third, comparable student enrollment; and fourth, availability of statistics. The figures being used are from 1968 statistics since those are the most recent complete figures available. Some changes will have occurred, but the purpose is to point out areas of need, and the gaps between the two types of institutions would probably be the same.

My intention is to show statistically that there is *need* in black academic libraries. It is no longer valid or useful, if it ever was, to try to prove how well black institutional libraries compare with the national norm. What is the crux of the matter is that students who opt to attend the most prestigious black institutions still have so much less available in the form of resources and services than the student at a white institution of comparable size and prestige. In the FICE report, levels of funding to traditionally black institutions are compared quite revealingly with the total outlays to show the disparate proportions of funds allotted. What is not revealed, however, is the fact that there are so many more traditionally white institutions. An even more revealing study would be the per capita expenditures by the same Federal agencies for the white student, as compared with that for the black student. Such a study would cut across the traditional lines of black institutions vs. white institutions.

During last year's Conference on Federal Information Resources, Mr. Casper Jordan presented "An Inventory of Black Academic Libraries", with some interesting statistics. I am not going to repeat the facts presented in that study; what I would like to do is to compare the resources of some of the top predominantly white academic or research libraries, and the student populations they serve, with some of the top black institutions' academic and research libraries.

First, let us consider student access to information in the two groupings. In the traditionally white institutions, (see Chart I) 20,038 students, of which 245 are minority students, have access through their respective institutions to a total of 5,270,114 volumes of library materials (these figures exclude microforms). To contrast, 15,753 students in the predominantly black institutions, of whom 11,356 are black, have access to only 1,091,879 volumes of library materials through their institutions.

To compare again, the three predominantly white institutions being used for the purpose of this comparison have as their total operating budgets $7,068,001 of which $3,875,028 is for salaries; $2,001,259 for purchase of books and other materials; and the range of expenditures per full-time equivalent (FTE) student ranges from a high of $569 to a low of $266. In the same institutions expenditures per FTE faculty member range from a high of $2,572 to a low of $1,166.

In comparison, the black institutions have a total operating budget of $1,590,783, of which $810,673 is for salaries; $567,180 for purchase of books and other materials, and the expenditures per FTE student range from a high of $126 to a low of $73. In these institutions, expenditures per FTE faculty member range from a high of $1,315 to a low of $599.

These comparisons are quite revealing when one considers absolute facts to be faced such as the prices of books today, the replacements necessary, the salaries necessary to attract and remunerate the librarians adequately, the expenditures per student in terms of materials and services, and the expenditures per faculty member necessary for such items as sabbaticals and other institution-supported training and/or support of the staff. The figures for expenditures per FTE faculty are particularly relevant when one thinks of conference attendance and other types of necessary extra-institution exposure for the library staff.

To take another aspect—the service aspect (see Chart III)—in the first group, the predominantly white institutions, 408.8 library professionals, 45.0 other professionals, and 393.8 non-professionals provide library services for 20,038 students; while in the black institutions only 54.0 library professionals, 24.6 other professionals, and 47.0 non-professionals provide library services to 15,753 students. Now it *is* true that student aid can be, and is, a major help to a library in manning several essential positions; but even here there is a great disparity. In the first group, the libraries can count on a cumulative figure of 128,472 hours of student assistance, while in the predominantly black institutions the similar statistics yield only 90,751 hours of student assistance.

There is one final set of comparisons (see Chart IV). In the first group of institutions, where salary figures are available—in this case only one was available for this sample—the salary for the Chief Librarian was $23,750 in 1968; those of the Associate or Assistant Librarian between a high of $15,900 and a low of $14,750; the heads of major units, between a high of $12,404 and a low of $9,462; for other librarians' a high of $8,390 and a low of $8,239; and non-professional salary scale ranging from a high of $5,551 to a low of $4,238. Contrast these figures, if you will, with salaries for comparable positions in the black institutions, where salaries for the Chief Librarian (again, where figures are available) in 1968 ranged from a high of $19,758 to a low of $11,000. There are no figures for Associate or Assistant librarian because this position did not exist in any of the institutions in the sample. Those for heads of major units ranged from a high of $12,040 to a low of $9,000; and other librarians from a high of $9,548 to a low of $8,333. In the case of the non-professionals the high was $5,287, the low $3,929.

From these salary figures it is clearly evident that even with varied costs and standards of living in the different areas of the country, there can be relatively little inducement, comparatively speaking, for an eager, ambitious librarian to eye the alternatives with any other than a certain bias.

How is all this of importance to the assembly here today? The whole picture presented is that even the most prestigious black institutions' libraries have problems of budget, bad conditions, poor personnel resources, and grave inadequacies in library resources. To re-state the remarks of the FICE report, the predominantly black institutions do not even have the personnel or tools to compete with any chance of success for their own fair share of Federal funding, especially for libraries. The problem is compounded when one realizes that many previously traditionally white institutions, prodded into progress in their integration, have broadened their recruitment to include outstanding black students and superior black faculty members. This has militated against the best efforts of most of the black academic institutions—even in the instances where salaries have been brought up to levels somewhat competitive with those in the white institutions.

In seeking solutions to bring about an equalization of opportunity and access to information, one must be very careful of easy solutions such as considering consortia, or inter-library loans, or computer or network tie-ins. Instead, one must look at the problem on the whole, and design a process whereby the situation as it exists can be remedied, and new directions can be designated for the future. Suggestions for this route are presented in the following general recommendations which are modifications of the FICE recommendations to the Administration for increased support of black academic institutions, to relate them to the libraries of those institutions.

Short Term

1. COSATI should convene a conference of Federal officials, representing all agencies having education or research programs, and the administrators of libraries in black institutions. The conference should include an explanation and review of all Federal support programs which could be applied to library, media, or research centers, and establish means by which these agencies and the institutions can maintain easy communications.
2. The Administration should request Federal agencies to review their education funding programs for libraries and library-related agencies, and make a special effort to redirect more of their funds to undergraduate library facilities in black colleges. This would necessitate the services of a special agency, such as the COSATI Sub-committee on Negro Research Libraries, acting as an inter-agency review panel, to work with black college library administrators in determining areas of need, and types and amounts of support relevant to the particular needs of each institution.
3. Federal agencies should be requested to inaugurate program-orientation and proposal-writing workshops pertaining to specific programs having relevance to black college or university libraries. These agencies should solicit proposals from these colleges, which should be informally reviewed and returned with criticism prior to final submittal. This has been long-established practice with other institutions, and would be expected to result in more funded proposals and higher institutional morale.
4. Federal agencies should be encouraged to formulate a policy to utilize black college libraries as outstation resource centers for agency-funded centers of inquiry, research, and program development.
5. Regional Offices, particularly Atlanta and Dallas, should be requested to provide library representatives to maintain liaison with the black educational institution libraries. Further, the use of these colleges as sites for library conferences and places for an intercharge of library personnel and ideas should be encouraged.

Long Term

1. Provision should be made, in any Presidentially-appointed national advisory council on black affairs, for representation by black academic library personnel as well as black national leaders in the field of librarianship.

2. Steps should be taken toward the support of changes in legislation for the elimination of all matching fund requirements by black colleges or those enrolling large numbers of students disadvantaged in either economic or academic terms.

3. Appropriate Federal agencies should be directed to propose new legislation or revisions to existing legislation which would relate directly to the economic and informational needs of black students and to the special needs of black academic libraries which aim to fill those informational needs. Such proposals should include institutional grants and expansion of the current Developing Institutions Program administered by the Office of Education, to include specific provisions for the development of library resources at the same time that curriculum and facilities development is undertaken.

4. The proposed National Foundation for Higher Education should be so structured as to provide an adequate informational resources support program at the same time as it provides an adequate institutional support program. The Administration should include in its consideration for funding, a National Center for Higher Education Inf[illegible]tion which would provide directory and counseling servic[illegible] collegiate institutions on available support programs in t[illegible]xecutive branch and similar services to the administrators o[illegible]oraries in these institutions. The Center library specialist could assist college and university faculty and/or library administrators in reviewing appropriate programs and in approaching program directors for guidelines. This Center would constitute a locus for academic and library referral to Federal agencies, and it would be of special usefulness to black academic libraries.

(*Referenced charts appear on pp 33-34*)

Sources of Statistics

American Library Directory 1968-1969, 26th Edition. R.R. Bowker, New York & London, 1968.

Federal Agencies and Black Colleges. Fiscal Year 1969. Revised January 1971. Federal Interagency Committee on Education.

Education Directory 1968-1969 Part 3 Higher Education. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare/Office of Education/National Center for Education Statistics. OE-50000-69.

Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities. Data for Individual Institutions. Fall 1969. By Bronson Price, Library Surveys Branch, United States, Department of Health Education and Welfare/Office of Education/National Center for Education Statistics. OE-15023-69.

Undergraduate Enrollment by Ethnic Group in Federally Funded Institutions of Higher Education. Continental U.S.A. Fall 1968. United States Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights/Research and Analysis Branch. OCR-201-69.

F. KURT CYLKE

When Burt Lamkin and Jean-Anne South first asked me to participate in this panel, I silently questioned my credentials and my ability to offer a meaningful presentation. Federal libraries and librarians, after all, have not devoted a significant part of their effort through the years to working with the non-Federal library community. Their libraries are primarily mission-oriented. On reflection, however, I decided that this very point—the lack of heavy involvement—was reason enough to justify my participation.

Today I will not talk about Federal aid to Negro research libraries in general terms. That can be addressed better by someone else. In 1969 the U.S. Office of Education alone provided $78 million to 100 black colleges. Of that amount, $1.5 million went to 80 black colleges to help build library resources and to provide opportunities for training librarians.[1] Obviously both Burt and Jean-Anne are more knowledgeable than I about this effort, and about similar grant programs in other agencies.

The Federal Library Mission,[2] adopted by all agencies, includes a section devoted to the relationship between Federal libraries, the research community, and the general public. It states that Federal libraries should extend their services to these groups.

I will consider what types of assistance can be provided black research libraries by Federal libraries, and how a meaningful program may be implemented. My purpose is to stimulate thought—not to present an exhaustive list of possibilities.

It should be understood that, when I talk about Federal libraries, I refer to the more than 1900 presidential, general, academic, school, and technical libraries serving the various agencies of the Federal Government.[3] I do not include the three national libraries in my general remarks unless specifically noted.

Background

The concerns of librarians administering black research libraries are multitudinous. They have been stated on many occasions. Most recently the COSATI Subcommittee on Negro Research Libraries identified 38 specific concerns. Most could be assisted by Federal help of some sort: some could be addressed by a combined Federal library/Negro library effort.

I believe 8 of these concerns can be profitably addressed by a joint group:

1. Collection building.
2. Availability of Negro research materials.

3. Resources: Black Studies, Education, Chemistry, Physics, Biological Sciences, Sociology.
4. Catalogs and indexes.
5. Computer applications.
6. Availability and use of Federal information resources related to undergraduate needs.
7. Library facilities and building consultants.
8. Mailing list status.

The first three items—*collection building, availability of Negro research materials,* and *resources*—are all more or less related. Let me theorize for a moment as to how the problem of identifying, acquiring, and building collections might be addressed.

The Federal Library Committee recently distributed *A Study of Resources and Major Subject Holdings Available in U.S. Federal Libraries.*[4] This 670-page volume includes an enormous amount of material. It identifies, for example, that the Defense Language Institute at the Presidio of Monterey, California, has a research collection of Swahili language material and will lend to non-Federal libraries. What is not stated, but what could be worked out, is an arrangement to provide acquisition advice to Negro libraries based on the Institute's experience. Other Federal libraries with strong African languages and history collections are also included. The Industrial College of the Armed Forces, the Smithsonian Institution Libraries, and the Library of Congress are three examples.

Other assistance in collection development might be arranged through imaginative use of the Library of Congress Exchange and Gift Division Surplus Books Program.

The Library of Congress does permit authorized representatives of libraries access to the "donation" collection material. I will quote from Nathan R. Einhorn, Chief of the Exchange and Gift Division, as to the duplicate collection:

> The Library of Congress has available at all times, for donation to educational institutions and public bodies in the United States, surplus books which are not needed for its own uses. These publications are miscellaneous in character and, although shelved for inspection, are not arranged in any way, nor have they been listed or described. Most of these books have been turned over to the Library of Congress by other Federal agencies, and the collection consequently includes few publications at the primary or secondary school levels. Some books useful to school libraries do, however, appear in this collection from time to time.
>
> The Library is not in a position to undertake the selection of books from this collection, nor does it pay transportation costs. Any eligible organization wishing to authorize a representative to review this collection and make selections on its behalf should

provide its representative with a letter of introduction to be presented in the office of the Exchange and Gift Division.[5]

Arrangements can be made with pertinent Congressmen to provide franked mailing privileges. Why not have one or two authorized Washington representatives select collectively for black research libraries? The University of Western Ontario at one time provided such a service for a group of Canadian libraries. The idea is not unique, and it would be tremendously helpful. A brief glance through the file of libraries currently using the service indicated that the six Negro libraries I checked were not included.

Catalogs and Indexes: These are simply specific research and resource materials needs which can be served by the same tool. Special collections, unique card indexes, major resources, etc., are all noted.

Computer applications: The Federal Library Committee Task Force on Automation project comes to mind. Many of you will recall that Paul Berry mentioned it at our last conference.[6] You will remember that two results are anticipated. One is a guide for librarians identifying what to consider when thinking of automation; the other is a presentation for administrators giving the positive reasons for automation in the library environment. Both tools could be used, almost without adaptation, to the benefit of Negro research libraries.

Library facilities and consultant services: the Federal Library Committee developed a Federal Library Advisory Service (FLAS) to provide necessary one-time, no-cost, impartial library overviews. A call for participation resulted in the establishment of an advisory group consisting of representatives from U.S. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Labor, and Federal Library Committee. Consultants are equipped to assist in nearly all areas. Again, arrangements might be made to assist non-Federal libraries.

Management problems can be addressed by Negro library staff participation in the *Executive Workshop in Library Management and Information Services* being developed for use on a regional basis by the FLC Task Force on Library Education. Workshop sessions will employ case history, panel discussion, lecture, and audio-visual techniques to the point of broadening participant background in the areas of manpower training, Federal Library Committee activity, and evaluation control. The first Workshop will be held May 10–12, in Atlanta, and working black librarians are welcome. Of course, internships for practicing librarians are also possible.

Mailing list status: FLC list implementation has been partially completed and will be expanded. Those black libraries on the FLC list have already received, in addition to the *FLC Newsletter*, copies of *Research in Librarianship in the U.S.A.* by Andy Eaton, a listing of U.S. Civil Service Commission training programs pertinent to library needs which those Negro librarians working for State funded libraries are eligible to attend.

In summary, then, I believe there are many ways in which Federal libraries and Federal librarians can assist Negro research libraries. Some have been noted today. Open communication between the Negro research library community and the Federal library community can identify other areas worthy of consideration for cooperative action. The burden for action is upon both groups. For example, now that the Library of Congress Exchange and Gift opportunity has been identified, the Negro community should pursue the matter. Individual initiative should be encouraged to develop innovative approaches, and the Federal Library Committee will work closely with the COSATI Panel on Library Programs to effect the implementation of such programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Federal Agencies and Black Colleges: Fiscal Year 1969.* (Revised, January 1971.) n.d., pages 22-25.

2. U.S. Federal Library Committee. *Federal Library Mission.* Washington, D.C., The Committee, Library of Congress, 1966.

3. Benton, Mildred. *Roster of Federal Libraries, 1970.* Washington, D.C., The George Washington University, October, 1970.

4. Benton, Mildred. *A Study of Resources and Major Subject Holdings Available in U.S. Federal Libraries Maintaining Extensive or Unique Collections of Research Materials.* Washington, D.C., The George Washington University, 1970.

5. An unpublished form-letter sent to those libraries requesting information about the Library of Congress Exchange and Gift Division.

6. Berry, Paul L. "FLC Automation Package Concept: Research Library Applications", in *Proceedings of a Conference on Federal Information Resources: Identification, Availability and Use,* Washington, D.C., March 26-27, 1970. Publication and distribution arranged by COSATI Task Group on Library Programs.

ANNETTE PHINAZEE

I had an opportunity to read Mr. Cylke's paper in advance, and I have decided to express some of my reactions to his comments for two reasons: (1) I see no need to repeat the concerns of librarians administering black research libraries if he feels that they have been stated on many occasions, and (2) I respect his ability to identify the concerns that can be profitably addressed by this group.

I would like to discuss first the 78 million dollars given to 100 black colleges and the 1.5 million dollars sent to help 80 black colleges build library resources and to provide opportunities for training librarians. I am not a good mathematician, and my experience as an administrator in an educational institution is very limited, but when I divided those sums by 100 and by 80 I concluded that the figures are very small when compared with the amount needed to support research in the average American university. You may answer that the Federal Government is supposed to supplement rather than support, but I would still challenge these figures when compared with the level of supplements awarded to predominantly white research institutions.

I would also like to remind you that this kind of support to black colleges has not been given very long. Viewed against the background of 200 years of free labor given to this country by black people, and the inferior or non-existent public educational and library facilities that taxpaying black people had to endure for over 100 years, these funds could not be considered generous portions, and certainly not gifts. I do not want you to think that I am ungrateful, nor do I want to dwell on this point, but I do want the group to understand that when black librarians ask for opportunities to share Federal resources and services they are not asking for charity. They are merely reminding the profession that they should no longer be ignored.

Mr. Cylke's reference to "acquisition advice" raises the question in my mind as to whether or not the service should be limited to *advice*. My library experiences have not included extensive acquisition work, but I remember reading about programs in which the Government actually gave funds to the Library of Congress to purchase foreign materials for a selected group of libraries. Are black libraries participating in this program? If not, is there any reason why at least two of the libraries with the largest collections of black materials should not be *in* the programs?

The Library of Congress Exchange and Gift Division's Surplus Books Program is a wonderful source of materials. It would certainly reduce costs if there could be authorized representatives in Washington to select materials. However, I suggest that the *specific* needs of the recipient institutions be analyzed *very* carefully in advance. One of the major problems of black librarians is the task of screening gifts. It takes a great deal of time to do this, and they frequently do not have the personnel and the space to handle the job. The poorest schools receive hundreds of boxes of books that they cannot use, particularly in the spring when sincerely concerned people clean their attics. And, unfortunately, some college presidents insist that these books be kept in their efforts to acquire the number of volumes required by the accrediting agencies. *Please,* let us be sure that we help rather than hinder these librarians.

There is much information concerning automation, but I am not sure that the *real* answers are in the literature. I hazard a guess that black research librarians know "what to consider when *thinking* of automation" (most of them have been thinking, reading, and even attending institutes on it for quite a while) and most of them know the "positive reasons *for* automation," but what they often do not know is how to get it for their libraries. I read accounts in library literature of huge sums of money appropriated to white research libraries by Government and private agencies to *plan* and to conduct research for a period of *years* in order to test the *feasibility* of certain systems, and I was sure that many answers would be available. But, when I began to inquire about their sharing some of this information in 1968, as the reports said that they were supposed to do, I was gravely disappointed. There needs to be more *specific* information about what is actually *working* successfully, and the extent to which these librarians are willing to share, not only information, but facilities. I am no computer expert, but I do not believe that there is enough difference in the needs of white and black research libraries to justify having a number of separate computers doing the same thing in the same city. In at least one instance these institutions have received a considerable amount of public funds. Black librarians are eager to cooperate, but I know from experience that in some instances their efforts to cooperate have either been rebuffed or ignored.

"Library overviews", "internships", and "individual initiative" are all fine, and I hope that they will materialize, but I would like to make a few observations.

Internships were provided for two years by the Ford Foundation through Atlanta University. In all cases they were black librarians visiting white libraries for two weeks or a month. Only two of the libraries visited were in the South. A conclusion of a significant number of the host librarians was that the black librarians were quite well adjusted and were able to teach them a few things. Some of the traits that black librarians have to share *are* "individual initiative" and resourcefulness. Black colleges could not have survived and produced the large number of national leaders that they have if they had not had these qualities. It is not difficult to educate geniuses in an environment that includes the largest research library in the world. One does not have to select as carefully with a large budget. My summer's work at the 5th Avenue and 42d St. New York Public Library taught me that even I could be an acceptable reference librarian working with a good catalog and a reference collection that filled a room two blocks long. I *know* that it takes much more initiative to give good reference service, as Mrs. Gaynell Baarksdale has done at Atlanta University for over 30 years, with a comparatively small collection and meagre assistance; or to make international contacts long before communication was easy, do the scholarly research on her own time and with her own money, and build an outstanding collection as Dorothy Porter has done at the Howard University Moorland Collection; or develop a good collection and make it look like a dynamic library in an old gymnasium as Zenobia Coleman did at Tougaloo College. Two of these three are private institutions that have had comparatively little Federal assistance in proportion to the human resources that they have produced for this country. And these are only three of many examples that I can recall quickly. So, my plea is that when you offer to make an "impartial library overview," be sure that you are *really* impartial. Don't go with preconceived ideas and close your ears and eyes and talk down to people. Please do not assume that library service is not being given merely because the collection has not reached one million.

Black librarians are more aware of their limitations than anyone else. They have grown up being told that they are inferior, and they have spent their lives working twice as hard trying to catch up, with much less encouragement than most white librarians are accustomed to receive for less effort. They welcome truly open communication, constructive criticism, and *practical* advice. But I do wish to remind you that we are not begging—we have earned the right to participate, and many of us are capable of doing it if we are given the opportunity to do so.

The COSATI Subcommittee on Negro Research Libraries had its first meeting in February 1970 and was convened subsequently in August and in February and March 1971. It was formed to develop recommendations designed to improve communications; to stimulate cooperation; to foster joint planning and programs among Negro research libraries, Federal agencies, and other research libraries. Activities have included the discussion of objectives, problems, and ideas; the development of two proposals to coordinate black materials and to investigate the feasibility of consortia; and a study tour. The members have taken their responsibilities seriously and look forward to expanding communication and cooperation among themselves and with other librarians. We invite you to join them in this endeavor.

JOHN P. McDONALD

I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the previous speakers. I appreciate Burt Lamkin's invitation to join them on this panel.

As I understand it, my assignment here today is two-fold. First, it is to indicate how libraries, particularly large research libraries, may have assisted Negro research libraries in the past, how they may be cooperating with them at present, and how they might plan to work together in the future. Second, and perhaps the more important part of my assignment, is to suggest ways in which the Association of Research Libraries, of which I am President-Elect, might be of greater service to Negro university libraries.

I do not mind admitting that I was not Mr. Lamkin's first choice for this panel, but was drawn into it late in the day when illness prevented another ARL librarian from appearing. I mention this only to explain that time has not permitted me to make a complete survey of my ARL colleagues to determine whether there are currently productive relationships between any ARL libraries and libraries within the purview of the COSATI Subcommittee on Negro Research Libraries. I have several examples of cooperation to cite, but I hope that, in the discussion to follow, we will learn from librarians in the audience about other effective programs in which they are participating.

There are a number of inter-institutional programs involving predominantly Negro colleges on the one hand, and established universities on the other. In former years, these Big Brother relationships were viewed as one-way streets in which the prestigious institution shared its wisdom and experience, and even sometimes its substance, with the smaller institution. More recently an attempt has been made to establish more balance to programs of "reciprocal enrichment", to use the phrase of the American Council on Education. Under various auspices, the following pairings were established: Cornell and Hampton, Indiana and Stillman; Michigan and Tuskegee; Brown and Tougaloo; Florida State and Florida A & M; Tennessee and Knoxville; Princeton and Lincoln; Southern Illinois and Winston Salem; North Carolina and North Carolina A & T; Notre Dame and Xavier; Georgia and Paine; Iowa and Le Moyne. Vanderbilt, Purdue, and Tennessee A & I represent a group effort, and the University of Wisconsin has arrangements with Texas Southern, North Carolina College, and North Carolina A & T, as another example.

As might be expected, no two inter-institutional programs are exactly the same. Elements vary from place to place, but those most commonly found are student and faculty exchanges, faculty study opportunities, cooperative research, consultative services, institutional self-study, curriculum revision, and facilities planning. Only rarely is library development specifically identified as an area of inter-institutional cooperation. This, I believe, reflects the situation on most campuses where the library has a relatively small voice in academic planning.

The inter-institutional combinations I have cited are, by no means, all that have come to my attention. They are, however, representative of the full list, and I have chosen to emphasize them because each of the combinations contains an institution belonging to the Association of Research Libraries. Among the fourteen inter-institutional programs, however, only four have any discoverable library component. The four are: Cornell-Hampton, Indiana-Stillman, Brown-Tougaloo, and Princeton-Lincoln. I have no doubt that there are other instances of inter-library cooperation of the kind we are discussing, but they have not come to my attention. Nevertheless these four can serve to typify the kind of cooperative activity that has so far taken place.

The Cornell University-Hampton Institute program envisaged library cooperation in the following terms: 1. Surveys of library holdings by competent graduate students for the purpose of recommending additional titles for purchase at Hampton Institute. 2. Donation to the Hampton Institute Library of complimentary copies of books published by the Cornell University Press. Whether even these very modest goals have been achieved is not known to me.

In the case of Indiana University and Stillman College of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, I understand that Indiana's University Librarian and a number of subject specialists surveyed the Stillman collections and made recommendations for strengthening holdings. They estimated the cost of effecting these improvements, and they suggested acquisitions methods to be followed in carrying out their recommendations. Again, I have no information on whether it was possible for Stillman to implement these recommendations.

Brown University has assisted Tougaloo College in the following ways. Brown Librarian, David Jonah, fresh from the successful planning of the Rockefeller Library, served as a library building consultant to Tougaloo and made many visits to the Tougaloo campus for this purpose. In addition, the Brown Library offered summer employment opportunities to two Tougaloo students and provided Tougaloo with books from its duplicate holdings. Under a different program, a library staff member from Tougaloo was employed, for purposes of training, in the Brown Library Circulation Department. Once again, I have no objective knowledge of the effectiveness of this program.

The Princeton University-Lincoln University program involved visits back and forth of appropriate library staff members, exchange of information on Afro-American holdings, the offering of valuable duplicates, and at least one library building consultation in which Princeton's then Associate Librarian, James Skipper, gave of his considerable knowledge of academic library building planning.

Valuable as these programs may have been, and we would have to go to the black colleges to get any meaningful appraisal, there seems little doubt that what has been done is a far cry from what is needed. I am well aware that under Title III of the Higher Education Act, many programs not cited here have involved inter-library cooperation. My own institution, the University of Connecticut, had such an arrangement with the College of the Virgin Islands where I was privileged to work with Librarian Ernest Wagner on interior planning for his new library building and on the staff required to operate the new facility. Yet even when we add in the Title III programs, we are left with a very poor record of achievement.

It is not my function here to discuss needs; the others have done this extremely well. I only point out that the needs have been outlined before. Much can be found on the subject in E. J. Josey's article "The Future of the Black College Library" in the September 15, 1969 issue of *Library Journal.* We should not forget that, in February of last year, at a conference sponsored by the Institute for Services to Education and supported by a grant from the Council on Library Resources and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, many of the needs of Negro research libraries were identified. We have, in short, much information about the problems. What we need now are more and better ways of attempting to solve them.

It is obvious that the problem is so large that attempts at solutions will have to come from many quarters. I suspect that some of the best results will continue to come from institution-to-institution contact, and there is reassuring evidence that the black colleges are learning how to assist one another. There are very promising consortia in North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. In Atlanta, aided by a $233,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation, a Center for Cooperative Library Development is assisting a large number of Negro colleges. This Carnegie grant is noteworthy because it is specifically designed to assist libraries. While foundations have been helpful to black colleges generally, they have not often identified the library as a vehicle for support. In my view, much more could and should be done to encourage foundations to understand that an excellent way to strengthen an institution is to strengthen its library.

I want to turn now to consideration of the Association of Research Libraries and its relation to the problems outlined above. Before doing so, I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to an article by Dr. Herman R. Branson entitled "Inter-institutional Programs for Promoting Equal Higher Educational Opportunities for Negroes." This chapter from volume 35 of the *Journal of Negro Education* supplied much of the factual information I have presented about cooperative programs.

Now, what of ARL? The first thing to have in mind is that it is an association of libraries and is, therefore, far better equipped to speak to the problems of libraries than to the problems of librarians. Because it is, for the most part, an association of very large libraries, it has concerned itself with resources, particularly those that are designed to support *advanced scholarly work*. It is not surprising, therefore, that a great many of the activities of ARL are directed toward the development and organization of resources and the physical and bibliographic access to resources.

As research libraries have grown and become more complex, and as ARL itself has expanded and developed, it has increasingly turned its attention to other areas of concern. Under the general rubric of library management, the Association has established committees to deal with such diverse matters as training for research librarianship, university library standards, automation, and a number of other topics in the general realm of administration. Further, as the Association has gained in strength and influence, it has turned its attention outward in an effort to relate to the public sector, particularly the information industry.

I discuss the structure of the ARL at this length only to suggest where its competence as an organization may lie. It is largely with collections and resources, increasingly with administration and management, and to a very modest extent with personnel and training. As an organization, ARL has had only a peripheral interest in facilities, although it has recently helped to bring into print Ralph Ellsworth's book on the economics of book storage and Keyes Metcalf's study of library lighting.

My point is: *if* Negro research libraries wish advice in these traditional areas of ARL's concern (and I stress the *if* because we must not repeat the mistake of telling these libraries what *we* think they need) but if assistance is wanted in collection development, personnel training, and management improvement, then I think ARL must find ways to respond. I believe, for example, that if the Negro research libraries were interested, ARL could form a committee to work with them in ways that seem most profitable to all concerned. Among other things, the committee could serve as a clearing-house for problems and proposals, placing each before the proper group or committee, or when appropriate, calling upon the member library best able to provide the needed service. As the permanent staff in the Association is very small, most matters would of necessity be referred to individual libraries. Experience would teach us much, and over time we should find it increasingly easy to achieve that "reciprocal enrichment" that is essential to self-respect on both sides.

In closing, I would like to say that I have discussed this idea of a new ARL committee to work with Negro research libraries with the officers and staff of the Association, and I find them enthusiastic about it. The matter will be brought before the ARL Board at its meeting in May, where I have no doubt of its general acceptance. A healthy symbiotic relationship should, therefore, be well underway by summer.

DISCUSSION

WILLIAM WELSH, *Library of Congress:* I would like to make two comments.

I think that, with regard to our surplus books disposal program, the truth lies somewhere between Kurt's remarks and Annette's remarks. We process about seven million items a year through this program, and, as Kurt said, they are not arranged by subject. There is material that might be used by Negro colleges. It would take quite a bit of effort, but if there is someone in the Washington area who could be designated to look at this material, I think it might be profitable. It's not a gold mine, however.

Secondly, we administer a program which operates in India, Pakistan, UAR, Israel, and, until recently, in Indonesia. That is a program designed to acquire multiple copies of publications from these areas using foreign currencies. We have used various committees of ARL and ALA to assist us in selecting the recipients. I think we are trying to work something out with Phil McNiff, who is the Chairman of the Foreign Acquisitions Committee, to aid us in the designation of universities. May I suggest that you get together with Phil and myself to discuss it? I think there is some possibility of working out a program.

CYLKE: I would like to clear up a misconception that might have come from my talk. First, with the duplicate collection that Bill Welsh just referred to, I was thinking of having someone who is familiar with your need, perhaps someone from Howard, perhaps someone from Bowie State, perhaps someone from the Office of Education—someone who understands the problem—to serve as the selection agent.

Chart I—Enrollment, volume holdings, and volumes per FTE student

			Enrollment			Vols/Stu.
	Institution	Total	Undergrad.	Minority	Total Vols.	FTE
WHITE INSTITUTIONS	A	7,552	4,722	91	2,036,441	280
	B	4,756	3,301	125	2,099,761	438
	C	7,730	3,955	29	1,133,912	145
	Totals	20,038	11,978	245	5,270,114	
BLACK INSTITUTIONS	D	8,737	5,654	5,064	603,305	73
	E	3,086	2,934	2,934	213,990	71
	F	3,930	3,360	3,358	274,584	75
	Totals	15,753	11,948	11,356	1,091,879	

Chart II—Budget breakdowns and expenditures per student FTE and expenditures per faculty FTE

					Expenditures	
					Per	Per
	Institution	Total	Salaries	Books	Student	Faculty
WHITE INSTITUTIONS	A	$2,257,204	$1,180,318	$ 692,614	$310	$2,497
	B	2,726,870	1,480,352	905,523	569	2,572
	C	2,083,927	1,214,358	403,122	266	1,166
	Totals	$7,068,001	$3,875,028	$2,001,259		
BLACK INSTITUTIONS	D	$1,049,422	$ 492,016	$ 390,303	$126	$1,315
	E	276,242	180,521	67,792	92	599
	F	265,119	138,136	109,085	73	1,008
	Totals	$1,590,783	$ 810,673	$ 567,180		

Key to Institutions:

A. Duke University	D. Howard University
B. Princeton University	E. North Carolina Central University
C. Massachusetts Institute of Technology	F. North Carolina A & T State University

Chart III—Library staffing patterns

	Institution	Library Staff Libr'ns	Library Staff other	Library Staff non-Prof.	Prof. library staff per 100 FTE faculty	Hrs. of Assistance student	Hrs. of Assistance other
WHITE INSTITUTIONS	A	276.0	37.0	93.7	12.5	57,897	18,113
	B	78.3	——	167.8	7.3	37,400	24,133
	C	54.5	8.0	132.3	3.4	33,175	——
	Totals	408.8	45.0	393.8		128,472	
BLACK INSTITUTIONS	D	31.0	15.6	28.0	5.8	33,070	1,099
	E	14.0	——	12.0	3.0	23,681	——
	F	9.0	9.0	7.0	6.8	34,000	300
	Totals	54.0	24.6	47.0		90,751	

Chart IV—Salaries

	Institution	Chief Libr'n $	Assoc. or Ass't Libr'n $	Heads of Major units $	Other Libr'n $	Other Profes-sional $	non-Profes-sional $
WHITE INSTITUTIONS			(2)	(8)	(52)	(1) (36)	(93)
	A	23,750	14,750	11,254	8,390	5,679	4,238
						5,515	
			(6)	(29)	(38)		(156)
	B	Refused	15,900	9,462	8,330		5,551
			(3)	(10)	(39)	(8)	(123)
	C	Refused	Refused	12,404	8,239	11,510	5,143
BLACK INSTITUTIONS				(10)	(20)	(15)	(28)
	D	19,758	——	12,040	9,548	6,376	5,287
				(7)	(6)		(12)
	E	15,000	——	Refused	9,212	——	5,141
				(5)	(3)	(9)	(3) (4)
	F	11,000	——	9,000	8,333	5,800	4,479
							3,929

Research Libraries and the Information Community

(Conference Discussion Paper)*

NEAL HARLOW
Dean Emeritus, Rutgers University

This preliminary paper is written for representatives of research libraries who will attend the Second Federal Information Resources Conference. If there is opposition to following the leads suggested, and it is strong enough, perhaps some other action will be taken; any move to coordinate and improve the library services of the country for the benefit of research may be better than none. If they are not good enough, may they be bad enough to stir up alternative action.

The "Information Community"

There is no "American Information Community" if this implies a group of people with similar interests and objectives who share common cultural and historical values. There are instead only factions: (1) government agencies with their characteristic missions, basic political drive, and bureaucratic environment; (2) the communications industry—publishers, research organizations, equipment manufacturers, fired primarily by the profit motive; (3) the professional societies—discipline-oriented associations caught up in the scramble for information in subject fields; (4) universities, with their educational and research motifs, dedicated to cultural and intellectual development; and (5) the libraries in schools, universities, business, and industry, attempting to satisfy, close-up, the individual informational and educational needs of users. Another cross-section of the field would separate the "public" sector (Government) from all the "private" interests.

If there is to be a "community" of action in the information field, therefore, each of the groups must identify the interests and objectives which all hold in common (along with those which may be divisive and contradictory). They must accept the fact that, in a democratic society, each group has a right to a share of the action and responsibility. And they must realize that their common goals can best (or only) be achieved by working deliberately together, not as rivals. As long as government, industry, libraries, the professional societies, and universities persist as "factions", most of the action in the information field will not only be uncoordinated and uncertain but often contrary and couterproductive.

---

*This paper was distributed in advance of the Conference to all invited attendees to serve as a focus for discussion. To further stimulate thought and discussion, a reactor panel, representing various segments of the library and information communities participating in the Conference, was invited to prepare and deliver the comments and reactions which appear following the Conference Discussion Paper.

A Structure for Action

Although one hears about a "library community", the research libraries are not fully coordinated in working with each other or with other groups in the information field. They are represented by a number of organizations (the Association of Research Libraries, the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Special Libraries Association, the Medical Library Association, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Association of State Libraries, and others). Government, meanwhile, has an authorized unifying body in COSATI, with a specific Task Group on Library Programs, affiliated with the Government-wide Federal Library Committee. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will soon enter this picture. Government is therefore prepared to act with some initiative and authority, while the research libraries can respond only partially and with limited force and persuasion.

A parallel task group is needed to unify the research libraries in dealing with the information field. It should fuse the concerns of all of the research libraries in the public and private sectors, identify the interests and goals they have in common with other information groups, and then confer with Government, industry, and the others to explore their like objectives and to develop a unified program to achieve their common ends. They should also discuss divisive factors and work toward greater understanding and cooperation in respect to them. Since the Association of Research Libraries exists, is perhaps of operable size, is most fully focused upon the library problems of research, and has an experienced Washington office and existing relationships with the Federal Government, it is suggested that it take the lead in establishing a task group and in assuming the initial responsibility for its operation and function—accepting the dictionary definition of "task force" as a temporary grouping under one commander to carry out a specific operation or mission. A structure to enable the research libraries to deal with the information community would thus be created (perhaps eventually to assume some permanent form) to promote active discussion, education, negotiation, and joint action.

Opportunity for Action

COSATI, through its Task Group on Library Programs, has recently (and unexpectedly) encouraged joint action with the research libraries by getting the parties together, telling the librarians what their Government has to offer,[1] and asking them what their wishes are. So far, the librarians have responded by talking mostly about their visceral needs—for catalog cards, bibliographies, publications, and funds—and the failure of Government to serve the nation through the research libraries

---

[1] See the proceedings of the March 26–27, 1970, Federal Information Resources Conference.

(with the librarians remaining unsympathetic when Government agencies similarly talk about their own missions and problems). They have presented some rather sprawling "demands" upon the Government: for "representation," "coordination," and "sharing"; for more communication, greater responsiveness, and stability. But neither the libraries nor the Government have been ready, nor apparently able, to relate their programs to the requirements of the whole information community; they have hardly yet realized that such a concept is desirable or feasible.

Each section of the information community has its primary mission or missions—the research libraries no more nor less than the others—and these can be ignored only at an institution's peril. But what goals and interests do (or can) the groups have in common? Which are in conflict but negotiable? What is incompatible? What must be accepted or ignored? It is upon such openness and awareness that joint programs can be built. Librarians have worked with Government (as recipients of funds and services, on committees, in research, in arguing cases); they have profited from industry (ERIC publications are an excellent example, as are, in general, the essential products of publishers, equipment makers, and commercial research establishments); and they have, on several occasions, joined forces with the professional societies. Nevertheless, librarians have tended to be suspicious of political motivation, profit orientation, and narrow disciplinary interests as they affect public information. They have been much less alert to the limitations of their own stand and to whether their "needs" truly represent the interests of their clientele.

Each of the groups in the information community has its detractors. The research libraries have, until lately, been the most immune to attack (though often ignored) and therfore the least self-critical, the least reactive to their environment, and the least adept at self-preservation. They have not often been energetic in expanding their output of services or in increasing input through a network of agencies. They have regarded themselves as being central to the universe of knowledge, while the information capability of the country has grown with little regard to their performance or plans. That Government, industry, the professional societies, and the universities continue to be interested in the research libraries is still happily evident, and the libraries had better trade on this favorable balance of concern while it is still in their favor. Librarians are being pressed on all sides to justify their claims to funds, resources, place, prestige; they are challenged by administrators, politicians, the scientist and scholar, the anti-intellectual, and the radicals of right and left; and they will need to ally with the information community to improve their chances of survival. This will mean listening as well as telling. It will mean putting the consumer ("user", "voter", "market", "public") instead of the organization in the center of the system, and framing programs and negotiating support from this new point of vantage. It has been asked: who takes the national view in respect to public information? In their prevalent mood of self-concern, it is not the research libraries.

Procedure for Action

1. It is proposed that the research libraries establish a joint task group in union with the information community, the initiative to be taken by the Association of Research Libraries (the organization closest to the center of concern), which will negotiate with other organizations of research libraries to establish a fully capable, foresighted, and sufficiently representative membership.

2. Using the task group as an innovating and initiating force, reassess the informational needs of the research community, and the place and stake of the research libraries in satisfying them, ascertaining what these findings mean in redetermining the attitudes, conduct, and functions of the libraries and the level of their support.

3. Working with representatives of Government (and concurrently or later with the information industry, professional societies, and universities), identify the informational goals held in common by the information community, those which offer promise for coordination, and those which are seemingly contrary.

4. Develop a statement of objectives for the research libraries which takes into account both the informational needs of research and the capability of the libraries (as a segment of the information community) to supply them; and take it directly to the "policy" or "power" structures of the organizations represented to see whether, (a) it seems radical enough to comprise a basically changed view, (b) significant modifications can be proposed at this organizational level to improve the libraries' potential, and (c) it can be adopted as official policy.

5. Develop a specific program of informational activities for the research libraries based upon the range of possibilities opened up by the broadened viewpoint and alignment: What categories of services are required by the research community? For which of them do the libraries, (a) have a major capability and obligation, (b) accept a secondary or shared role, or (c) yield to other agencies? Which services will they provide only to their local or primary clientele and which to an extended audience? What categories of libraries exist or are necessary for the implementation of the services planned? What forms of inter-library organization and cooperation will be required by a nation-wide system (for collecting, organizing, storing, inter-communication, referral, transmission)? What functions will be served by existing libraries and what by units yet to be established? Which costs will be paid by the local organization and which by the user, Government, or other sources? The conclusions reached should provide a program and priorities for action.

6. Implementation of the action can perhaps begin with the necessary changes in emphasis within the local libraries in line with the new outlook and practices; by increasing the effective use of existing resources through in-service training of staff, improved public information, and the

systematic education of users; developing augmented services of the kinds and on the scale required by the new objectives; organizing the national network of resources and activities to produce the quality and amount of bibliographic and substantive information materials visualized; and developing Federal and local legislation and other operative agreements and compacts to provide the necessary organization, resources, and financial base—all of the action being coordinated within the information community and taking the national view.

Toward an Information Community

Is the proposal too utopian, surrealistic, or improbable? Is it too indirect to cope with urgent, present problems? Is it conceptual rather than procedural? Does it revive abstract questions which practical men have dismissed long ago? A good many traps and hurdles lie on the way to adopting and implementing such an agenda. But the first step is familiar; it is organizational. It involves setting up a committee; and the initial responsibility, if accepted, is fixed in the ARL, which has the necessary resources. (Let us not argue overlong whether it should be the ARL—a delaying procedural action.) The responsibility of the proposed task group will need to be clearly stated at the start, and the crucial character of its business emphasized in order that people, competent for the uncommon task, will be appointed. By means such as this some of the most basic problems of the library and information community can be directly confronted. A group with jurisdiction and influence can speak for the research libraries, and fundamental action will be taken to turn limited and partisan interests into a national program to benefit the user.

Conference Dissussion Paper
Reactor Panel

Panel Moderator:

Thomas R. Buckman, Northwestern University

Panel Members:

Philip J. McNiff, Boston Public Library
Martin M. Cummings, National Library of Medicine
William T. Knox, National Technical Information Service
William S. Dix, Princeton University

THOMAS R. BUCKMAN

It seems to me that Neal Harlow's paper is a small masterpiece of compression and symmetry. It has economy and directness. He raises nearly all the questions; he answers very few of them. He suggests alternatives and procedures in the midst of a good many complexities.

His paper is spirited and provocative, and at times it stings like the blue-tailed fly. Yet, it disarms all opposition and invites agreement from every quarter.

But like any symbolic arrangement of words, it may be seen quite differently by its critics. The panelists, in the order in which they will speak are: Philip J. McNiff, Martin M. Cummings, William T. Knox, and William S. Dix.

Before we turn to them, I want to ask Neal Harlow to comment further on his paper which was distributed to all attendees.

NEAL HARLOW

We are now in the Second Conference on Federal Information Resources and in my second speech. The first paper, given last year, dealt with two sectors in the information "community"—the Federal and the private (each with different objectives and ideologies)—which have to learn to work together if the information system is to function. But "because of reciprocal provocations on both sides" (so the paper read) "an inflammable area of contact exists between them which needs to be explored, disarmed, and pacified." The prerequisites for cooperation were declared to be the development of mutual *respect* and *credibility*, identified areas of *compatibility* (since the best of friends are so only "in spots"), and a greater *tolerance* to differing forms of behavior and expression.

As I remember it, there was something of a testimony meeting here in this room after that paper, led off by the high archon of COSATI, who voiced a twinge of penitence. Expressions from the private sector rather tended to take the form of demands and complaints.

My paper for today goes on to develop a fuller concept of the information community, which is described as being made up of five sectors or "factions". They are: the Federal Government, libraries, the information industry, the academic societies, and the universities, all of which must be involved, if there is to be a "community of action", in the field. My personal concern is chiefly with the libraries, to whom the paper is primarily directed.

I have not attempted to tell the research libraries what they should be doing that they are not doing now; but I have taken, as I said somewhere, a "conceptual" rather than a "procedural" approach by describing the ecological system of which they are a part and indicating what some of the interrelationships are so that they can, themselves, decide what the appropriate action is.

Research libraries go round-and-round in their own little orbit—one of five information groups circulating about a common center of gravity which we call the "community of users." All have been placed in orbit for some good, social reasons. But if we do not know that the system exists, but believe that we are the center and keeping us in motion is what counts; or that our sphere is the only inhabited one, and the others are comparatively barren and lifeless—such a philosophy will eventually fail us, because it is founded upon misconceptions.

Libraries may be the closest to the center of the system—to the users—but their orbit may also be very small and their view restricted. The Federal Government is more aware of the total system because there are voters in it. Industry is more alert because of the necessity for customers. The universities pay their libraries' bills and are increasingly dependent upon outside groups for their daily bread. Libraries have been more able to maintain a Ptolemaic outlook, and their cosmologies have but slowly taken the expanding universe into account. I do not claim that Government and industry have been less self-serving—only that they have been more sensitive and reactive to changing public needs and more ready to try new, promising alternatives.

We need to form a concept which includes and explains all of the forces involved, and to deal with them according to this enlarged design or plan. This is what I have called a "conceptual" approach (although I closed with a suggested procedure to get us going).

The paper has been said, by a perceptive critic, to be argumentative rather than scholarly. As bespeaks an ex-professor, I have great respect for erudition; and I might have started with an historical approach, framed hypotheses, collected data, made analyses, drawn conclusions, and provided supporting documentation. This might have gained me greater respect in this enlightened company. But the reader also said that it was about the right length. This is a long conference; and I wanted, at best, to be logical and meaningful; but, above all I wanted to incite some action, for action, if it is to be taken, must begin here.

I can imagine the research libraries going on in their traditional pattern, intent upon their own growth but being unable, in the long run, to meet the increasing competition for institutional and Government funds, or to provide the services required for their own justification. Government and industry, after a long interim of doubt and ignorance, have come to realize that libraries can perform an essential function. Through these conferences the Government has taken a tentative, (maybe timid, not entirely selfless, but nevertheless potentially significant) step toward coordination. The research libraries can either make something of this opportunity or fritter it away through inattention, querulous conduct, or inactivity. My suggestion is that we do something specific about it ourselves—now.

Why a task group representing the research libraries as proposed in this Conference paper? Group action grows out of some kind of structure. Research libraries are a distinctive group with special functions. They are also highly individualistic even in their cooperation, being ready to accept promised benefits, provided that participation does not limit their own initiative. Therefore they require a strong, visible, unifying force and a clearer impression of their responsibility to the rest of the information field.

The task group is needed to do two things: to coordinate the activity of the research libraries and to develop significant relationships with the other segments of the information community.

Since I only mentioned self-coordination in the paper, let me quote two recently published comments upon the state-of-the-art of cooperation among libraries to emphasize the need.

From the *Final Report, Jan. 1971, of Collaborative Library Systems Development* (embracing Chicago, Columbia, and Stanford):

> Cooperation was difficult to maintain because of distance, different design philosophies, heavy work loads and strong personalities . . . there was little to suggest that a universal system would emerge from their work which would be applicable to other libraries . . .

And from the *Two-Year Report, 1968-1970, of FAUL, the Five Associated University Libraries* (comprised of Binghamton, Buffalo, Cornell, Rochester, and Syracuse):

> Several lessons have been learned in the process of 'working toward compatible machine systems:' 1) national authority is needed . . . 2) the libraries which are more highly mechanized are least willing to move toward centralized system development . . . 3) at least three members consider themselves prima donnas . . . 4) the prima donnas are essentially competitive with each other . . . 5) few if any members really want to divert significant local resources to centralized system planning . . . Guilt more than anything else produces any action at all . . .

There is clearly a vacuum here in leadership at the national level which a task group could happily fill (if it is made up of the right individuals).

The need to develop more substantial relationships with other segments of the information community boils down to this: if the Federal Government supervises the thinking and final decision-making, action at the national level will primarily represent its views, and the libraries will neither have developed nor expressed concepts and programs in which they play an equal role. If we eventually come to be a satellite of Government, accepting its formulations of information needs and means as our own, it will be because we have not analyzed and understood our own position in relation to the information system and exerted some control over it as equals and coordinates. We need a body both to unify the research libraries and to represent them to Government and the other parties involved in the action. Thus we can both share responsibility and gain essential support.

One last reason for a task group is to see that something real and sustained comes out of these conferences—so that we do not repeatedly assemble, listen, and disperse, wiser maybe, but no better organized to face our common problems.

PHILIP J. McNIFF

If one were to view this problem from the point of view of the user—real and potential—of information resources, one might properly develop the concept of an "American Information Community". This community need not be so monolithic that it must consist of "people with similar interests and objectives who share common cultural and historic values". It would consist of people whose diversified research and information needs have been clearly identified.

Having identified these needs, we might then look at Mr. Harlow's "factions"—Government agencies, the communications industry, professional societies, universities, and libraries—to establish areas of responsibility and priority allocations. The significance of public (government) versus private separation of responsibility in the information field would seem to be diminished by both the cross-utilization of staff on Government, university and private industry programs and by the mixed sources of financial support for these research projects.

In addition to identifying the interests and objectives which the various groups have in common, it might be well to identify the areas for which each group has a special responsibility. This responsibility should hold not only for the development of information, but also, as noted by Marion Milczewski at last year's conference and again this morning, for the sharing of such information. Existing scattered sources of special information and research resources stand in need of being made better known as to their whereabouts and accessibility. Basically, there is need for all segments to unify and coordinate resources and services in order to make better use of the ever expanding and increasingly complex information data in myriad aspects of research.

In the section, "A Structure for Action", Mr. Harlow quite rightly notes that the library community lacks total coordination. Research libraries are, and ought to be, more aware of their shortcomings. A proposed task group, parallel to COSATI, would indeed be useful in unifying the activities of research libraries in the information field and may indeed be a necessary step in the evolution of a comprehensive program. Ultimately, a unified, integrated, and structured approach, possibly under the direction of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, will be developed. But I do take exception, I think, to Mr. Harlow's identification of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as being completely Government oriented. If this is the case, then the National Commission is not really going to do the job which all of us hope to see done. The National Commission should be above all of these libraries, setting forth the goals, the policies and the program in which all of us, Government, industry, universities and others, can work toward a coordinated approach to the needs of the people—the users of information. This program would have proper concern for the users of information, whether the consumer be in Government, academe, industry or is just a plain citizen.

In considering the Information Community we must recognize the validity of Grieg Aspnes' plea "that private industry be included in any of your deliberations and exchange of information". He reported last year: "I am serving one of the very ultimate consumers of information. There is hardly a Federal agency that we do not deal with or depend on for this information".

If a special task force is necessary for the research libraries, will a third task force be required to unify non-government, non-academic activity in the information field? Possibly ARL, in taking the lead in establishing a task force, should involve representatives of non-ARL libraries via the Association of College and Research Libraries and industrial and business organizations via the Special Libraries Association.

There is inadquate coordination at all levels in each of the major groups involved in the information field—though progress can be cited in each area. Research libraries, as organizers and disseminators of information, must adopt a broad outlook in appraising the needs of their clientele and the potentialities in the free flow of information. Government agencies, universities, professional societies, etc. are generally both producers and suppliers of information. Research libraries of all types must collect and organize these products in order to ensure that all pertinent information will be readily available to all people as needed. This means not only the information that is collected by the individual library but the sources of information cooperatively available via a network of libraries. The availability of information must be widely publicized so that potential users will be made aware of the existence of the information, and programs of access to this information must be cooperatively developed so that research can be forwarded in an efficient and economic manner.

The call for coordination and cooperation is prompted by several factors:

1) Increasing multiplicity of research activities and complexity of societal needs and interests.
2) Fragmentation of subject specialization and, at the same time, a growing demand for interdisciplinary analysis.
3) Broadening interests of the research community combined with a diminishing likelihood of self-sufficiency for any instituion.

The Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc. study, *Problems in University Management*, notes: "The rapidly growing body of recorded knowledge will require improved access to library resources beyond those of the individual university. To accomplish this, linkages among libraries are becoming increasingly evident, with such networks growing in importance. Many librarians and users of library resources, however, express concern that the evolving networks and consortia of institutions operate sporadically and in an uncoordinated manner, and may include in their memberships inappropriate institutions in some instances."

Mr. Harlow, in the *Opportunity for Action* section of his paper, speaks to the beginnings of cooperation between the Government and research library components of society. One cannot overemphasize the importance of including all major segments—industry, professional societies, institutions and Government—in the identification of the requirements of the information community. If we are to develop a national view, each group will have to place the user or consumer at the center of the program, put aside self-centered interests, and organize balanced information service programs.

Even as task forces analyze possibilities and make recommendations on a broad national level, individual libraries might well look into their own areas, questioning their present efficiency and looking into an analysis of individual strengths and developing a program of sharing on a local basis for the benefit of the library's reason for being—the user.

MARTIN M. CUMMINGS

My review of Neal Harlow's proposal suggests that either the author or this panelist has mellowed. I found both the background issue and his suggested procedures for action to be reasonable and potentially achievable.

He is correct in stating that there is no "American Information Community." My experiences suggest that information science at times is more a political science than a technical discipline. I agree fully with the characterization of the community as a conglomerate of factions rather than a community of action.

Also, I agree that library organizations have not responded fully to the important questions regarding "representation", "coordination" and "sharing" which are involved with determination of the national action orientation program. However, in recent years the American Library Association and the Association of Research Libraries have demonstrated effective political action within Government circles.

I offer support for his statement that "librarians have tended to be suspicious of political motivation, profit orientation, and narrow disciplinary interests as they affect public information. They have been much less alert to the limitations of their own stand and to whether their 'needs' truly represent the interests of their clientele." However, I believe these attitudes, attributed to librarians, stem from their education and training in library schools and should not be identified exclusively to the working library community.

Dean Harlow may be somewhat optimistic about the use of task groups to unify research libraries in their efforts to deal with the governmental and private sectors. COSATI has already opened its doors to the library community; the real need is to relate libraries to the private technical and publishing groups.

I offer several suggestions which I believe might strengthen Mr. Harlow's recommendation that research libraries establish a mechanism (task force) to affect a union with the information community. First, I suggest that, since libraries serve an enormous constituency, their new policies and power structure involve the user community. This is difficult to achieve however, because research libraries have varied clients and different problems. Secondly, I suggest that research libraries might have a profound effect on the publishing industry by using their purchasing power (through unified acquisitions) to influence the cost and mechanisms for book and journal publishing. Finally, librarians must think in terms of multimedia information services rather than conventional services. This is the bridge to Government and private sector technology over which new arrangements and relationships must pass.

In summary, I believe Mr. Harlow has identified and described a real, rather than a contrived, problem. I believe he has outlined a useful basic structure for action. If followed with some modifications it may lead to the solution of the problem. I think he failed in the sense that his objectives to develop a community, organized to develop a national program to benefit users, does not involve *them* in the process.

Having stated my support for this paper, I now ask myself whether he really believes what he wrote. I have an annoying suspicion that, in some areas at least, he expected members of the library community to disagree with him. I hope he is not disappointed.

WILLIAM T. KNOX

I feel somewhat apologetic for what I am about to say. After all, I have had a good lunch on the ARL, and I have had an opportunity to meet some very good old friends; and yet, at least three people have said to me, "I hope you are going to be provocative". Apparently, then, I have a reputation to uphold which I will attempt to do. There are some things that need to be said.

The first ARL meeting that I attended back in 1959 or 1960 was held in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress. I believe my good friend, Bill Dix, was president—at least he was presiding over that session. A group of us from the Science Information Council, advisory to the National Science Foundation, asked for an opportunity to present the needs and problems facing the research community in this country to the research libraries, hoping that we could encourage and stimulate a burst of activity on their part to help the scientific research community.

We offered to make ourselves available after the presentation. I remember that Mr. Swank, the librarian at Stanford at that time, after the presentations, got up and said, "This is very interesting. It just so happens that practically all of us are English or history majors, and we really don't know what you are talking about."

During the coffee break (there were no further questions), I remember standing next to Bill Dix when he discussed with a friend of his the hot bidding that had gone on recently for acquisition of certain archival collections, and I drew the conclusion that this was really the most important problem facing the research libraries at the time. I must confess that I still believe it to be, if not *the most* important, at least one of the major problems concerning research library management.

My second meeting with ARL was in 1965 when, as chairman of COSATI, I invited members of ARL, ACRL, and ALA to Washington to discuss ways in which the library community could organize itself to respond more effectively to the needs of the research and engineering community. At that point we urged that the library community organize itself and specifically suggested a task force or committee. Some years later, the Joint Committee on National Library Information Systems (CONLIS), *was* formed. I haven't heard about it lately.

My third meeting with ARL was in 1967, in New York, when I gave a progress report on the COSATI Task Force on National Information Systems. Tom Buckman and I were mentioning this at lunch today. He said he had been there; I said "fine, then you can refresh my memory on what I said". He said, "I don't remember what you said."

So now I'm here at my fourth ARL meeting, and I'm sorry it wasn't last year, because I think Neal Harlow and Dick Chapin made it much more interesting then.

Tom Buckman mentioned that Neal's paper was a thing of symmetry and harmony. Such things are generally soothing and soporific. It fits the desire of most librarians for a neat and orderly world, and I find it so. Nothing actually works like competition in this world, anyway, and although libraries have competed for years as to the number of volumes they have, the number of miles of shelf space they have (preferably filled), and the number of valuable collections, and the amount of money that they have wheedled out of donots (who are really interested only in a plaque), they have never liked the competition from other information sources or other information services.

Actually, it has only been since COSATI first formed its Task Force on National Information Systems that libraries on a national scope have begun to bestir themselves rather vigorously. You may disagree with my assessment that this is probably the result of competition, but you won't change me from that opinion.

Last year it was said (and again the tone came through Neal's paper) that the Federal Government should have a single informational resource or a single information policy, or a single supra Federal agency setting down policies so that the libraries, especially the research libraries, can cooperate and know with whom they should coordinate.

It just turns out that there is no single Federal agency that performs a complete coverage of its designated area. You might think that the Department of Agriculture would do all that's required by the Federal Government in the area of food. Well, it doesn't. There are other Federal agencies that have a major stake in the food industry, at one point or another, or on food exports. This is just a rather simple example.

There is also not one single Federal highway built primarily with Federal funds to get from one city to another. There are generally alternate pathways.

I think you will find this to be true in the informational field as well from here on out. I think it's worth remembering that most adults, too, get along in their daily existence without any contact with, or service from, a library. We happen to be in an information-rich society today. Libraries were created as a societal institution when the society was poor in information resources. But we now live in a completely different era, and there are alternative ways in which people can get their information. They no longer have to go to a library; they can rely instead on the newsstand, on the TV, on contacts with people, and newspapers—on any number of things for the information they need, or think they need, to carry on their work.

The people in universities, of course, in charge of the research libraries, have the advantage of having professors who tell their students that they will not graduate unless they go to the library and do this, that or the other thing. They live in a situation in which numbers of research people—mainly in the humanities and the related areas—actually use the library as their laboratory. So they have this built-in user clientele. This does not pertain to the public sector, at least not to the same extent.

So I come today really with an air of watchful waiting. I have been looking at the ARL for ten years or more, so my question is, what will the ARL do? Not, what is the problem? Just, what will it do? Will it be along the lines of the ACRL? They, apparently, are very excited about the fact that librarians don't have the same academic ratings and the same academic progression steps as do their faculty counterparts, and apparently they are devoting a great deal of attention to insuring their rights by charter rather than insuring their rights by work.

I just want to end my provocative comments by suggesting a specific. It would be much easier to think about the complaints that have been made that relate to the specific problems of libraries. John Lorenz took a beating last year because the Library of Congress cards weren't being made available as fast as they ought to be. It's easy to seize on a specific like that and berate some of us Federal people for not reacting as vigorously or as quickly as we should.

Let me now suggest a project for the future—something on which you can do some useful work, because you are in advance of the real problem. Perhaps the real problem won't hit here for five years, and by that time something could have been done.

The project is establishing guidelines for communicating with the ultimate user via computer terminals. There are lots of people who are developing computer data banks. They are an inevitable part of our information society of the next ten years or even five years. Users have great problems utilizing these resources, and it seems to me that the library community, especially ARL, with its larger resources, could do a very useful job in trying to guide the development, not only of the hardware, but of the software, and of the procedures through which people—the ultimate users of this information—can communicate effectively and economically with these massive computer data bases. This is going to be a real problem for us, and I am enough of a humanist myself to want to be the master of the machine and not the servant of it.

It would, I think, be a very worthwhile project for ARL to undertake, to develop these guidelines. The hardware and software development is moving along much faster than our understanding of the problem itself. Libraries are now being besieged by computer manufacturers or by suppliers of computer data bases, saying "buy mine, and it will be of real benefit to you". Well, we don't know whether they will or will not, or to what extent those that "will be of real benefit" will, indeed, be of benefit. I think the librarians, since they are on the firing line, and since they are in daily contact with people who want to use information, can be a very large factor in developing what I would call proper guidelines.

In closing, I would just like to reply to Marty Cummings. There is nothing wrong with his suggestion of a library cooperative purchasing group. Some of you know, of course, either from reading the proceedings of last year's conference, or by attending and hearing Ed Brunenkant's discussion (or simply by being involved in one way or another with the program) that the AEC is doing it already for its libraries, and it seems to be working well. I guess my question is: why don't some of the research libraries do it?

WILLIAM S. DIX

All of us will agree, I presume, with this sentence in the first part of Neal Harlow's paper: "If there is to be a 'community' of *action* in the information field, therefore, each of the groups must identify the insights and objectives which all hold in common (along with those which may be divisive and contradictory)." The need for this identification was pretty clearly illustrated by the meeting held here a year ago on Federal Information Resources. I did not attend that meeting, but I read the Conference proceedings. To the observer, from a safe distance, the overall impression was that of ships on a variety of courses passing in the night, dim shapes looming out of the dark, then disappearing, greetings called out in passing, sometimes friendly, sometimes hostile. When a collision course sometimes seemed to have been set, there was a good deal of waving of arms and shouting. It must have been an instructive if not particularly edifying spectacle, and it was probably useful. It was definitely useful if it prompts us all to pay some attention to Mr. Harlow's suggestion and identify our common interests. This will be a long, slow job, and I do not propose to attempt it in ten minutes.

Yet I am moved to suggest, in the broadest terms, one of these "objectives and insights" which we hold in common. I have long been an advocate of international understanding. We may not like the Hottentots any better when we come to know them, and we may indeed come to detest them, but at least we know where we stand. That is a good place to start, and we may just make some good friends in the process.

I may as well start bluntly. One objective which we may all share (I say *may* because I can only speak for myself) is to get more money and support so that we can all keep on doing exactly what we are now doing. This may sound cynical, but I don't think it cynical to recognize that the normal human instinct, to defend what one is doing, is one of the factors which inhibits change. Change comes particularly hard when, after altering our own personal set of mind, we face the problem of redirecting the bureaucracy, large or small, which each of us heads.

Once we recognize this innate desire to keep on doing what we are doing as one of the things which locks us into competing on collision courses, we may be able to face more squarely the desirable changes of course.

Let me give one example. Look at one of the things which seems to divide some university libraries on the one hand from some Government science information agencies on the other. We university types have a tendency to defend stubbornly, and perhaps too universally, our tendency to build large collections—to devote perhaps too much of our limited resources toward the goal of an impossible completeness. It is time for us to recognize that exponential rates of growth cannot be continued forever. Furthermore, we had better recognize that at least some of the members of our science faculties do not share our traditional goal and themselves have no interest in anything but the most current information. This is obviously not true of all scientists—of most geologists, for example—but it is sufficiently true of those in some disciplines for the university librarians to be losing their allegiance in the increasing intra-university struggle for the library's share of the dwindling resources. It is obvious to me that we shall have to re-assess our acquisition and retention policies, hold relatively less material on our own campuses, and concentrate more on cooperation through sharing and specialization.

One obvious answer is something like the British National Lending Library of Science and Technology at Boston Spa. A pattern of well functioning, Federally funded regional institutions of this sort might enable each of fifty university libraries to cut its scientific journal holdings in half. (I omit the field of medicine, by the way, for I know nothing about it, but from where I sit it looks as if NLM has gone a long way in this direction.)

Why don't we already have something of this sort? I suspect that the desire to keep on doing what we are doing is one of the reasons. University librarians had no trouble in uniting to back shared cataloging, being quite willing to relinquish some individual cataloging. I submit that the individual collection-building syndrome has been part of the problem.

But what of the Federal science information community? Is it possible that they have been too pre-occupied with individual empire-building in delivery systems, just as the university libraries have been empire-building in individual collections? They talk a great deal about being mission-oriented. If their real mission is to serve the information needs of their own constituents, is it not possible that some of these needs might be served better by a "Boston Spa" created outside their own agencies, at considerable saving in public funds? Surely we have enough political imagination to construct a joint proposal to the Congress from the university community and the Federal science community. Or is each of us too hell-bent on doing things just as he is now doing them? A proposal of this sort would be a natural for the task force which Neal Harlow has suggested. If there is a quarrel with Neal's proposal, it would seem to me it simply doesn't go far enough in suggesting the solution of concrete problems as a kind of unifying force for the more theoretical structure that he has envisioned.

I think of the cooperation in the shared cataloging area which has come about among the three national libraries simply because it was a common goal, and a common mechanism was set up. There was a very encouraging amount of sharing there, of giving up traditional procedures.

Or, to take another concrete example, what about the proposed Federal Data Tape Clearinghouse? This could be an office to package and distribute, with a reasonable minimum package of software, machine-readable data collections from a number of Government agencies. The Census Bureau has made a start with the 1970 tapes, but it does not seem to me to have been a very good start. Presumably the Census people believe their mission to have been fulfilled when they publish the printed reports. But why? Why was it necessary for an outside organization, a national foundation, a consortium of libraries, and all sorts of other people to get into the act to repackage the tapes and develop ways of using them? Or indeed, why should users not be able to borrow material of this sort rather than buy it? Why should libraries not be willing to pay a reasonable rental fee if necessary, rather than buy?

The National Archives, I believe, has set a good example by setting up its regional microfilm repositories and proposing to lend film. I have been talking recently with an economist who has been trying to use the tapes for the Office of Education library statistics and having enormous difficulty with them. These tapes were, of course, created for internal use and made available as a courtesy to this scholar. But we are surely reaching an age where this format will be an alternate form of publication, when the controlling hand of an editor will be necessary, and when libraries will all go bankrupt unless some more rational form of distribution is developed. At the same time, we librarians will have to change our ways a bit and suppress our passion for owning things.

These are kinds of matters to which I hope the Harlow task force will address itself—all the way through, from the development of the concept to the enabling legislation and the appropriation if necessary. I would like to see before committees of Congress, people representing not only the university library community, but perhaps some of the agency people who see that they can be served outside of their own agencies. This will take a little bit of sharing; it will take a little bit of giving up our own individual empire building, but I believe that something like this could emerge from the pattern which the Harlow proposal envisions.

Manifestos are useful, but I have considerable faith in the ability of Federal information specialists and librarians, working together, to sell practical programs.

DISCUSSION

BUCKMAN: At this point I would like to ask Neal Harlow to reply as he sees fit to the panelists and then invite the panelists themselves to question each other or to comment. After that, we will welcome questions and comments from the floor.

HARLOW: I could probably just say "hooray" to what's been said and sit down, but that might sound like it's a place to stop, and this certainly is only a beginning if anything is going to come of this.

I want to say something about Bill Knox and his concept of democracy. Obviously, a democratic system, if it really means freedom, means freedom to compete, and I agree heartily that competition can be the life or death of trade; there is no doubt about it. But certainly coordination and cooperation should be as much a part of the democratic process as competition, although we have had more of the first than the latter.

I think even he realizes that Mr. Nixon is trying his best to get some coordination among the Federal agencies, and Nixon is not the first president that has tried to bring some order out of chaos.

What concerns me most is what this group is going to do about it. Have we got enough momentum at this point to go ahead and create some kind of organizational structure, so that we can proceed with the kind of things we have been talking about?

I have read a lot of reports recently, in writing this and a couple of other papers; and you know, when you come right down to the nitty gritty of what's happened in most of these projects, they don't amount to anything. You have got a lot going on; you are learning a lot, but when it comes right down to it, how has it affected the users? It hasn't affected them very much.

This morning, the last speaker was talking about the Negro libraries. *It's the same situation.* It boils right down to what John McDonald said. There is a lot going on, but it doesn't begin to get the kind of results that we should be getting. And so I hope that something will come out of this. The finger has been pointed at the ARL, partly because we've got the ARL Executive Director in this room as it were, but whether or not the *ARL will do anything about it, I think* depends on the kind of support given from the general community such as this.

KNOX: I just wanted to take up Bill Dix's promise and suggestion of some better *way of coor*dinating the scientific literature program of the Federal agencies in making the stored information—especially that part of it on computer tapes—available to the research libraries.

I think this has a number of possibilities which the NTIS would be delighted to explore, if there is a group with which we can explore it.

We were created specifically to discharge this responsibility back in 1950 in connection with the printed reports, and we have been gradually expanding the area of coverage out of the Clearinghouse so that, even today, computer tapes are being sold. We are planning to bring into the scope of the operations, statistical and economic data such as those from the Census Bureau and other places, and I think it would be a natural to work with some group representing the research library community.

CLIFTON BROCK, *University of North Carolina:* I want to ask, first of all, a factual question arising out of the Conference last year. Let me read two statements made then and then ask Federal people to comment on them.

Last year the argument was about the transfer of cost of Federally produced information which, as librarians, we have been getting free. The first comment was by Herbert White in which he said: "The area in which the Federal Government should do far less is in the field of volume distribution of documents, publications, microfiche, journals and other publications products. It is the area of greatest cost to Government programs . . .". The other comment by Mr. Brunenkant of the AEC was: "The cost of any major information system is really wrapped around the input cost". My questions are: Where *are* the greatest costs? Are they in the input, packaging, etc., or in the distribution?

KNOX: I can just give you a figure. It costs ten times as much in the Clearinghouse to bring in the report, catalog, abstract, index and announce it, than it does to actually print and mail it to people who order it.

CUMMINGS: I hope it's not immodest for me to say that I think the National Library of Medicine operates as an on-demand service for user requirements. I thought that Bill Dix made a very direct and pointed suggestion that something like the National Lending Library service of the United Kingdom operates in this fashion.

While I have the floor I would like to comment on several things that were said earlier. First, with regard to the problem of resource building, I have some data, based on our experience since 1965 when we started to make funds available to libraries throughout the country to improve medical library services. Between 1965 and 1970, we awarded $44,500,000 in grants to more than 300 libraries throughout the country. I have recently analyzed the utilization of these funds by these libraries. You have to appreciate that a grant, once awarded, is really no longer tightly controlled by the granting agency, and the monies can be used in accordance with local needs. I was astounded to find that more than 50 percent of these funds were used by libraries for building collections. That, I think, is real evidence for the concern expressed here that everybody wants to have a bigger collection. I was surprised because the intention of the program was to improve *service* to users, and I found little evidence that there was any correlation between service orientation and size of collections.

I want also to add some data to the question raised about cost of input and output. I know that our experience is not the same as the one cited earlier. It does not cost ten times more to acquire, index and catalog materials than it does to deliver service. I think there is something awry here. I think these differences in figures reflect the difference in philosophy as to whether the library is really oriented toward delivery of information or acquisition of documents.

I would think that the ratio is more like 2 to 1, rather than 10 to 1. It costs money to deliver information if you use technology such as photo-duplication and computer oriented terminal distribution. This is not an inexpensive system, but it *does* provide user satisfaction, and I suggest that maybe one of the things to be studied is this basic question of allocation of our resources.

Maybe we should be spending more on delivery and dissemination and less on acquisition, and I think performance measurements could be made to see whether, in fact, this does provide a more useful user satisfaction.

BERNARD URBAN, *Dept. of Housing and Urban Development:* I would like to address my question to Mr. Cummings. This raises the question of quality of information.

Are we, indeed, to record all knowledge, or are we to approach it from some sort of qualitative standpoint?

CUMMINGS: The way the National Library of Medicine operates is as follows: First, it *does* try to acquire a single copy of every document or informational item that is relevant to health or medicine, because we believe that one place in the United States should have this. From this array of important, mediocre, and unimportant material, about 30 percent is carefully reviewed, indexed and announced to the medical profession. All of the book and monograph holdings are cataloged and announced.

We acquire everything, if we are doing our job properly, analyze a third of it and announce promptly that it's available through published indexes, catalogs, and through our computer services.

HARLOW: Of that 30 percent that you say is carefully reviewed, indexed and announced, if you could afford to do it, would you do more than 30 percent?

CUMMINGS: No, we would not. And if there weren't tremendous pressures—not on the part of the users, but on the part of the publishers—we would do a lot less than 30 percent.

My point is that, every time we change the list of journals indexed and drop one because it's parochial or non-substantive, there is an enormous pressure brought to bear on your National Library of Medicine to reinstate it, because, in fact, this serves not only as an information vehicle to the user but, in a way, a quiet advertising mechanism for the publisher.

BUCKMAN: It seems to me that one of the questions that has been raised here is about the utility of large historical collections which have been accumulated by college and university libraries for service to the humanistic fields and, to some extent, in the social sciences. The orientation of people in Government information agencies is directed toward science and technology which is understandably not very much interested in historical collections.

But are we to believe that we should abandon one of our basic and very important missions in the universities, and give most of our attention to the repackaging of information and the installation of computer terminals and the like? These, although important, do not address themselves to the needs of our clientele entirely. And there is a difference in mission here; we do have a responsibility to these other disciplines. In that regard, I find what seems to me to be a serious gap in the thinking of the representatives here—Bill Knox and Marty Cummings—with regard to the mission of the libraries. I wonder if we might have some comment on that?

JERROLD ORNE, *University of North Carolina:* Your point is one I was about to make. I think there is an inadequate conception here of the role of the librarian and the research libraries of this country.

Most of these research libraries are in universities, and to believe for a moment that the librarian determines the size and rate of growth of his library is visionary. It's naive. I don't mind the fault being laid at my door if I'm guilty, but I can carry only so much influence with the faculty. The size and character of a library in a research university is determined, in the first place, by the character of the faculty, and that institution's mission.

Perhaps we have been too acquiescent, and I don't doubt this is true. In fact, I have a paper coming out presently which will say it is—that the librarians should have more to say about the organization of an academic institution and its goals.

That's only one aspect of what you are talking about. The second, which troubled me again in what Mr. Knox said, was the general idea that he speaks mainly from the point of view of the science community and a Federal agency or a director of some Federal operation. And Marty said it too, when he said, "We collect everything in our field."

Here is an individual, in fact the head of an organization, who hasn't got a faculty—who can *decide* if he can get the money to collect everything in his given field, and rightly so. I don't object to this. But it is not the same thing; he does not have the same community of users. In fact, except in the case of medicine and agriculture, I would ask what is the community of users of the Federal library? Is that a community? I think Neal might speak to this point.

But these are two different approaches altogether, and now we are faced with a third problem area, and that is the advent of the computer. Both of our communities of users, and all of our concepts of building collections of past times are shot because a computer is so omniverous that it eats a very large part of our substance. What is the community of users for this information? What proportion of the community is it going to serve?

In the community of research libraries, we have to find answers to all three of these points. None of it is very easy. I don't think we will do any of it by pointing to the deficiencies of the past. I don't think, either, that we are going to be able to change everything about the past.

Although you can envision from the Federal point of view, Federal centers of distribution, there is no way you can decentralize this availability in the same measure to 50 states or to 50 regions in our lifetime or in the foreseeable future, in any way that would, by itself, take care of the problem.

I have no answers; I've got questions. But I think my main point is I don't like to see us impugned for what we haven't done, because in fact, if we haven't done it, it's not for lack of trying.

RAY FRANTZ, *University of Virginia:* I couldn't agree more with that point, and I wanted to carry it one step further to say that the collections are built, to a great degree, by the users. We are talking about the users as a general term—the person who comes to the library. But Bill Dix made an important distinction that research is done in different ways. The way a historian uses a library is entirely different from the way a man who is editing a text in English uses it.

The historian will not care that we have the first, second, third and fourth editions of *Catcher in the Rye,* for example. The man working on a text cares very much.

The historian has to make a raid through the collection. At this point, the book works very well. In a way, he has to create his own bibliography.

But again in other fields, research isn't going quite the same way. So, I think one of the things we have to get back to to solve these questions is to do our homework and differentiate among the different types of research that are being done, and the manner in which the scholar carries on his research, and then frame our programs and our computer applications to the degrees of sophistication required for this kind of research.

We are not talking about a general use. The great library is for the sophisticated user, the eminent man in his field, who has particular problems, not only within his discipline of English or history, but has different problems in the manner of approaching a collection between the divergents concerned. I think this is one of the big points.

COMMENT: Rather than defend the library, because I think most of us understand what a library is and whom it serves, including Mr. Knox, I'm concerned about another problem which relates to automation and relates to a task force committee that could be created. That is the problem of the coordination between what I might call cataloging and indexing.

We all have to service our community, and we are going to need access to all sorts and forms of information being produced.

I am worried about how I can not only have access to that information cheaply, but how I can work with it when there seems to be a dichotomy between, what I might call, the hangups of librarians and the hangups of indexers.

I can see both sides, but I think this is an essential problem that we are going to have to address ourselves to, and I hope that will be a problem of the Task Force.

HARLOW: Everybody has been talking about having complete libraries. My notion is that a complete library should serve the whole country and not an individual institution.

We simply can't go ahead with everybody having complete libraries. That day is past. I think the National Lending Library that they have been talking about at Boston Spa in Great Britain is an example. Here is a complete library in a limited area. Everybody knows what he can get there because it's been well described.

I don't know whether we can get interlibrary loans or some equivalent anywhere in the country on call from the National Library of Medicine, or whether they, like almost everybody else, want to get as much of that lending done on a local level as possible.

So this, again, is a common cause. We need to develop a community of research libraries. I think we can't do lobbying. I think all of the library organizations can't go to Washington and lobby for whatever happens to strike them at the moment. We aren't going to get very far with it. We should know the main things to be lobbied for and then work at it the way the ALA has done. They have performed miracles. They are doing it today, I hope, up on the Hill. We've got to know what our priorities are as a group of research libraries—and not as a group of *university* research libraries, either.

We have had a lot of talk today about fireworks. After all, fireworks have one objective—to draw attention to something. And now we have drawn attention to the problem of the common causes which we have. We spent a good deal of last year's meeting in fireworks, trying to call attention.

My paper was mild this time because I think it's time to get down to business. We have had the fireworks. How are we going to organize the research libraries of the country so that we can use Federal resources, so we can lobby in Washington, so that we know what to do with computers, so we can answer the faculties on the campuses that want the big libraries?

When I read reports of libraries that have tried to cooperate with other libraries in developing selective acquisitions programs, they all fall down because they blame it on their faculties. The faculties won't stand for it.

Supposing there is a national organization which is not only cooperative but coercive in some way? And suppose that we can have this national group stand behind Jerry Orne and the rest of us when some faculty member wants to do something? We then are not acting as individual libraries; we are acting as members of the research community.

My belief is that until the research libraries themselves are organized, they can neither become members of a research community, nor operate effectively on the local level.

We have had a lot of talk. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to do anything about it today? Or are we going to go home now and wait until next year? I won't be here next year, I promise you. I'm not sure I'll write another paper on it, but at least at the moment, referring to an earlier comment, I believe what I say, whether it's true or not.

COMMENT: There may be a possible answer in a thought that I had when I read the paper before I came here. There is a mandate in his paper; I say give him a mandate.

COMMENT: I've heard a lot of things this afternoon with which I agree. You won't be surprised to know that I agree about 100 percent with Bill Dix.

In some respects, I think we are overstating the problem. We are trying to set off firecrackers to stir up excitement, where I'm not so sure that there should be excitement. I think that we, in university libraries, know that we are not perfect and that everybody isn't 100 percent happy, but in a good many of the university libraries, I think we are satisfying our customers.

I don't think that we are afraid of non-book material, as somebody inferred. I think we know that information comes in a lot of different packages, and we are willing to grapple with it.

The thing that comes to me, again and again, is that we think we can recreate an entire new mechanism and impose it on something. I just don't think that's the way change comes. It would be a good idea to get hold of this Boston Spa idea which I think would do more for libraries and the information community than just about anything that I can think of.

I would like to say one thing that I think has not been voiced here this afternoon, and that is that, in a way, I wish we would stop talking about having the research libraries get together. Let's have *all* kinds of libraries get together. I've been a public librarian, and I saw, in New York state, what a wonderful job could be done by the public libraries getting together in county and multi-county groups. Right now, a great deal of the problem in this country is not the shortage of resources, but the inaccessibility of these resources.

Content Coordination or Chaos

(Conference Banquet Address)

BURTON W. ADKINSON
American Geographical Society

Scholars in most fields of learning are overwhelmed with information. These scholars are increasingly asking that action be taken to give them reliable information, but not all of it! Even more perplexing are the information problems of those faced with solving today's societal problems. These engineers, applied scientists and administrators must draw from the findings of many scientific and other disciplines—in other words, the need is for multidiscipline or problem-oriented services. It should be emphasized that the major requirement of users is for facts or ideas pertinent to the problem at hand; these users tolerate the devious routes to information such as catalogs, indexes, bibliographies, abstracts, data compilations, etc., because they have no better guides to the needed information.

Yet one finds, over the past twenty-five years, that the major emphasis of the information communities (and there are many communities, as Neal Harlow has pointed out in his opening presentation) has been on expanding the size and comprehensiveness of files and data bases. But even more, these communities have concentrated on increasing the speed and flexibility with which information items can be technically organized, manipulated and distributed. This has been true whether the information was organized as a monograph, a journal issue, a technical report, an individual paper, an abstract, a bibliographic citation, an index entry, or a numerical compilation. But we have witnessed that the technical characteristics of different systems vary to such a degree that exchange of information between and among these systems is difficult and expensive.

More important than the technical difficulties is intellectual organization of these information files. Even if the technical characteristics of systems were compatible, how would one easily, inexpensively and effectively select from files on physics, chemistry, biology, engineering and meteorology, information pertinent to solving a pollution problem?

One should not conclude, however, that the author is advocating the reorganization of basic information files along existing discipline lines. It is essential to have files organized topically so that the pertinent parts can be selected for mission or problem-solving needs. These latter are constantly changing.

It is the thesis of this paper that the major emphasis of the information communities must be turned toward the analysis, evaluation and coordination of the information content of files. Today, when an attack is launched for the improvement of slum areas of cities; or the efficiency and effectiveness of a transportation system, or air, or water resources, information from many fields of learning is a requirement for solution.

Now is the time to start designing information and communication systems so that information from large files on physics, chemistry, engineering, geology, economics, sociology, etc., can be readily selected for use on specific problems.

The above challenge poses an exciting but complex problem for every segment of the information producing, processing, distributing and using population. Furthermore, no one or two of the sectors can solve this problem in isolation. It is going to take the best efforts of the governmental, professional, technical, industrial and commercial components of our society.

In light of the situation described in the first part of this paper, what can one suggest for improvement of activities in the United States? First, one should state some of the principal assumptions upon which his recommendations are based. During the next five to ten years, the following will occur:

1. Long line and satellite transmissions of large bodies of data will become economically, as well as technically, feasible.
2. Simultaneous access to computers by hundreds, if not thousands, of persons will be commonplace.
3. Optical and electronic character recognition techniques will have progressed so that most type fonts, special characters, and graphics can be input and output in most information and communication systems.
4. Consoles of many levels of sophistication as well as minicomputers will be low enough in cost to be in commonplace use in educational institutions, research and development laboratories, publishing houses, libraries, etc.
5. There will be a national data file on journals and other serials that can be interrogated from most parts of the country.
6. Some catalogs of major library collections will be accessible by remote consoles.
7. Index and abstract files of major disciplines, as well as many problem-oriented services, through electronic means, will be accessible to libraries and many specialized centers.
8. Texts of articles of selected journals in such fields as physics, chemistry, psychology, and mathematics will be available through remote access and microfilm.

In the light of the above and many other technical advances that will occur over the next five to ten years, what are some of the adjustments that must be made by those involved in communication and information activities?

Since this is a Conference on Federal Information Resources, let us look at the Federal establishment. First, there needs to be a much improved mechanism for planning within the Federal Government. COSATI, the Federal Library Committee, and the National Commission on Library and Information Science should develop a mechanism for coordinated planning and implementation. Second, there must be a more realistic method for acquiring and allocating Federal financial support for both Federal and non-Federal information activities. Major sources of Federal funding of non-Federal information activities should develop a coordinated program and should not use conflicting ground rules nor conflicting goals. Third, Federal information activities should be better integrated. One must go to a myriad of places to get information. In addition there is no one place where a person can go to find the proper source of information he wishes. The citation of a few services which the Federal Government has established illustrates that the Government has tried to solve the problem, but lack of an integrated network of these services has aggravated the problem. Here are a few illustrations:

National Cartographic Information Center
National Oceanographic Data Center
Pesticides Information Center
National Space Data Center
National Technical Information Service
Superintendent of Documents
National Referral Center
Educational Resources Information Center

Could not these services develop a referral mechanism so a person entering one Federal information center could have easy access to most of the others? If one turns to the non-Federal, non-profit information services, he finds the same lack of effective coordination and integration as he finds in the Federal establishment. One could ask why the Federal Government, which subsidizes, in one way or another, most of these services, should not insist on a more effective network of these services. However, it is questionable whether the Federal Government should insist on a performance that its own components have not been able to achieve. One can predict that both sectors must achieve, during the next ten years, better coordination and integration than now exists.

Coordination between these two sectors is a topic that could be explored in this paper but will not be pursued. Instead, let us consider requirements that must be met if the technical and organizational coordination and integration suggested above are to be effected.

As we stated earlier in this paper, researchers, applied scientists, engineers, planners, and administrators are increasingly in need of pertinent and reliable information and only accept secondary leads to ideas, facts, data and analyses because they have no better mechanisms. It is suggested that the primary producers and organizers must accept the responsibility for preparing and distributing meaningful summaries of the results of research, development and invention, as well as making available the full length documentation of such endeavors. It is advocated that there also be increased analysis and compaction of information. This should be done through expanding the critical and descriptive review process as well as increasing the information analysis activities.

The above activities should be closely allied with related research and development efforts.

The secondary services, especially the abstracting and indexing services, should introduce more analysis and selectivity and not concentrate so much on comprehensive (and, therefore, often superficial) coverage.

The information analysis centers must devise means to make their products more widely available through commercial, professional, and library channels. Many of these centers consider their responsibilities to be only to their immediate user groups. Lack of cooperation and coodination is particularly rampant in this sector of the information community.

The information centers on university campuses should turn their attention to delivering packages of pertinent information to their users instead of the bundles of bibliographic citations which so many now take pride in. To do this they will have to integrate their activities with libraries which really have the actual *information* in their collections.

Research and special libraries will have to increasingly recognize that most of the indices to the content of their collections are prepared outside their sphere. They must team up with primary publishers, information analysis centers, and abstract and index services so that their selectivity is more reliable. In addition, these libraries must move more rapidly toward a cooperative program for use of each other's resources and better integration of their services.

Finally, commercial information services must recognize that a significant fraction of their raw products is derived from other sectors of the information community. These companies should be approaching scientific and professional societies, research and development organizations, and Government agencies with realistic proposals for cooperation rather than making believe they can get along without the information products of scientists, engineers, scientific societies, and Government agencies.

All of the above suggestions lead to one conclusion; namely, there must be standardization in the techniques used to handle information and more rationalization in the organization of the intellectual content. To accomplish these complex tasks will require wholehearted cooperation and coordination within, as well as among, the different sectors of the information communities.

Reports Of The Discussion And Working Groups

Conference attendees were asked to join one of five groups which met as the last event on the first day's agenda. A discussion leader for each group was charged with directing the discussion in a specific subject area and reporting results and conclusions of the group to the Conference during the opening session of the second day. Following are the reports of that session and the ensuing discussions.

Priorities of the First Conference Recommendations

Discussion Leader and Reporter

Gustave A. Harrer, University of Florida

The things that we thought were recommendations, made in the course of last year's conference, have been grouped under three headings: National Items, General Topics, and Specific Proposals. The list, as presented here, indicates the names of the individuals principally involved, and the page numbers in the published proceedings of the First Conference where the recommendations are discussed.

It was noted that the "non-negotiable demands" presented by COALINGS (Coalition of Affected Libraries in the NonGovernmental Sector), were not included. It was conceded that they had generally been included in points covered by other speakers in the course of the Conference. It was the consensus of the group that the recommendations drawn from the minutes of the First Conference should be reviewed, and those no longer pertinent because of recent developments be eliminated.

National Items

1. COSATI must change its approach to take full account of current library resources, procedures, and facilities, and must focus on objectives and needs of research libraries in order to establish "a viable family relationship." *Harlow, p. 27–28.*

2. A catalog of Federal library services and written policy statements on them at the national level should be maintained. *Humphry, p. 108.*

3. A national plan of information and library development should be developed. *Humphry, p. 111.*

4. The Library of Congress should be designated by legislative action as the national library. *Chapin, p. 37* and *Humphry, p. 108.*

5. The Library of Congress, as the national library, should be empowered to work with the Office of Education to support library and information services. *Humphry, p. 108–9.*

6. Federal funds should be channeled through state library or education agencies. *Humphry, p. 111.*

7. Careful review must be given to funding the dissemination of information, not just collecting or generating it and handing it on to commercial firms. *Discussion, p. 13-15.*

General Topics

1. Librarians must shift to emphasis on user satisfaction which should then help to generate the public support that is lacking. *Harlow, p. 32.*
2. Libraries need to consider themselves responsible for information stored in any form and retrievable in any fashion. *Harlow, p. 34.*

3. National libraries must provide extensive printed or specialized bibliographic services. *Chapin, p. 40.*

4. More complete bibliographic control over Government publications, and policies of full and free distribution to libraries should be instituted. *Humphry, p. 100.*

Specific Proposals

1. Items requested from national libraries on inter-library loan should be of the "last resort" type. *Lorenz, p. 8.*

2. Photocopying service from the Library of Congress could be expedited if libraries would establish deposit accounts, thus eliminating the delay of cost estimates on routine copying. *Lorenz, p. 8.*

3. L. C. should provide prompt cataloging data and catalog cards. *Chapin, p. 38.*

4. L. C. should develop means of delivering cards quickly without transfer of cost to patrons. *Chapin, p. 39.*

5. L. C. should provide cataloging for research reports. *Chapin, p. 39.*

6. Prepublication cataloging must be pursued and encouraged. *Discussion, p. 12.*

Item 1, under National Items, relating to changing the aims and purposes of COSATI, was tabled. Items 2 and 3, relating to the broad planning, description, and development of national library and information resources, were combined, and it was suggested that this be a matter of high priority for the proposed "Harlow task force" for recommendation to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Items 4, 5, and 6, concerning the status of LC and its relationship to the Office of Education and state libraries, were felt to be properly a part of Items 2 and 3, once these were under serious consideration by a planning group. Item 7, relating to Federal agencies and the matter of direct public dissemination of Federally collected data was recommended to the Task Force as a matter of high priority.

Items 1 through 4, under General Topics, relating to bibliographical control and other services, were not discussed beyond determining that they were not directly related to Federal information resources, or because they were included in broader points above.

Under Specific Proposals, it was felt that Item 1; that is, the proposal that the national library should be only a last resort for inter-library loans, reinforced Harlow's suggestion of a national lending library for the United States. Proposals 2 through 5 were determined to be too detailed. Proposal 6 encouraged prepublication cataloging.

We ended up with the notion that Items 2 and 3 under National Items, as listed here, seem to us to make up a strong recommendation for a high-level planning group to work on an over-all plan in the area of Federal library resources and other library resources in the country. So the major recommendation was that steps should be taken toward national library planning, including Neal Harlow's task force and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The second recommendation was in a rather more specific light—but it seems to be something of a growing policy matter—and that is the question of dissemination of information by Federal agencies once they have collected this information. The recommendation, specifically, was that careful review must be given to funding the dissemination of information—not just collecting or generating it and handing it on to commercial firms for dissemination at an additional cost. The discussion related to the two major instances, that of the census tapes, where a major portion of the cost is being handed on to the public after the data has been collected; and, of course, the *Bibliography of Agriculture.* There seems to be little justification for the idea that the user should pay for this because, in both cases, the beneficiary is the whole population of the United States; and why should they, as taxpayers, not pay for the dissemination of information that is ultimately going to benefit them?

DISCUSSION

McCARTHY: In the current administration, there is a great deal of talk about revenue sharing, about returning decisions to the people, about getting things out of the Washington bureaucracy into the various state and municipal bureaucracies. I wonder, does this policy, with respect to information, not appear to be running counter to what I understand is the major thrust of this administration? It has been suggested that COSATI might advance the idea that the Federal Government has not performed its service simply in collecting the information. The impression one gets is that, in several instances recently, the Federal agency is simply turning information over to commercial disseminators. In the case of the census tapes, no provision whatever was made until the Center for Research Libraries and the Ford Foundation came forward to try and put the census tapes into shape so that they could be used.

KATHERINE STOKES, *Office of Education:* When I was analyzing the Special Purpose grants for 1967, 68 and 69, I found at least three places that came in for grants because they now have to pay for AEC reports—they had been depositories before—and some other reports too. It's robbing Peter to pay Paul. We're giving grants to help people defray expenses for formerly free things.

COMMENT: It seems to me that we have to remember that the libraries do not acquire this information for their own sake. They acquire it on behalf of other people, so that there are good reasons for us to secure this information as we have been accustomed to securing it in the past. It is not that we are the direct users, but we are the intermediaries.

HARRER: One comment that was made in our group involved the idea of turning some of the cost back to the user. This implies a reduction of the central budget; that is to say, we won't pay for it *here,* but we'll pay for it *there.* This, of course, is far from the truth. There has been no reduction in the central budget; there has only been an increase in *our* cost.

Most Essential Common Needs of Research and Federal Libraries

Discussion Leader and Reporter
Warren J. Haas, Columbia University

The assignment of the second working session was to identify the major needs common to all research libraries (whether they be Federal, state or private) that must be met if those libraries are to improve their performance. The suggestions advanced by members of the working group are incorporated in the seven statements that follow.

1. Any system that has as its objective the extension of service and the coordination of resource development must be built on a comprehensive and reliable bibliographic foundation. The country is moving towards computer based files of bibliographic information, but the movement is halting. Much effort of high quality has little national impact, and the overall picture of this activity sometimes seems more random than rational. To improve this situation, action on two fronts seems essential.

First, standards for all of the operations central to an automated, comprehensive bibliographic information system are required—realistic standards for the description of all formats; standards for the registration of information concerning location and accessibility; standards for the organization of files; for transmission formats; and for use of the system. The process for setting standards must be careful, and the principles governing the standards must be farsighted. At the same time, completion and adoption must be the goal, not perpetual refinement.

Hand in hand with the development of standards must come the development of a reasonable overall national plan for automation progress. Given a roadmap through the maze of automation, libraries will stand a somewhat better chance of having their individual efforts directed to valid segments. The principle expressed here could be likened to the process of building a wall of bricks. By standardizing the shape of the bricks we can make progress, even if we don't settle on uniform color and texture.

2. The process of preparing proposals for project support is complex, and we have heard from several sources during this conference that help is needed, especially by some of the smaller colleges that have neither the manpower nor the information that is required. It is proposed that ARL provide this assistance, either through a central office service or through the efforts of individual member libraries.

3. Regional and statewide systems are developing and, in some cases, becoming quite sophisticated. These systems, usually dedicated to extending access, need encouragement and, in some cases, better direction. ARL member libraries, acting individually, can, by their participation, help provide some of this support. As an organization, ARL can promote balanced development and be a force for integrating, on a national basis, the regional statewide systems.

4. There seems to be some possibility that assertions concerning information needs, and allegations concerning the shortcomings of the present methods, are at times too general to be useful and on occasion perhaps even misleading. Some researchers and some scholars are, in fact, finding the information they need when they need it; some are not. It seems essential that we identify specific groups of people and specific subject fields where improvement is most needed. The process of identifying, describing, and delivering the "packages" in which information is contained, to say nothing of the information itself, is almost overwhelming in its complexity. To reduce this complexity, the information problems of specific user groups need to be identified and critically verified, and the means chosen for their solution need to be suited to the task. There is enough to be done to keep librarians fully occupied—the profession can't afford to spend effort and resources providing answers for which there are no questions. Users must have confidence in their own information agency and must be willing to give it their enthusiastic support. We need to know more than we do about the usefulness and value of information. We need to understand better the meaning of the word, "service."

5. Truly distinctive research collections, whether general and wide ranging in subject scope or focused on a single major subject area, are a national asset. Such collections represent a purposeful dedication and substantial commitment to a social purpose by the institutions of which such libraries are a part. It is time that the national importance of such collections is recognized. If resource development is to be rationalized, if access is to be governed by need rather than by circumstances of geography, economics, or history, Federal financial support for services rendered by these libraries in the national interst is proper and necessary. Such support might come both in the form of direct payment and

in the form of underwriting the cost of such activities as the proposed lending library for serials, national data service centers, preservation projects, master microform collections, etc.—projects obviously important to all libraries and library users, but of major concern to the research libraries that, together, have assumed an obligation to preserve knowledge.

6. There is substantial evidence that the information systems we already have are often not effectively used. As new methods make the life of the researcher even more complex, it will become more important than ever that techniques and tools to instruct the user in the methods of system use be developed and made available at the points where the individual meets the machine.

7. Analystical terminology (subject headings, descriptors, thesaurus terms) is growing collectively to proportions that rival an unabridged dictionary. An overview of this terminology, and quite possibly control of its growth, seems essential.

Reciprocal Assistance Between Federal and Non-Federal Research Libraries and Information Agencies

Discussion Leader and Reporter

Maryan Reynolds, Washington State Library

While the assignment was "reciprocity", the group gave more attention to the question of services *from* the Federal community. An effort has been made to concentrate on the discussions which were directed to the assignment.

The maximum objective was not achieved. The only areas identified need to have further examination as to the method of implementation.

The main points were:

1. A task force is needed to examine the question of "user fee" philosophy as to its validity in two areas: Depository Libraries and Interlibrary Loan.

The group felt that the depository libraries are the point of contact with the Federal constituency; therefore, to charge for the information was inconsistent with the whole concept of depository systems.

In the area of interlibrary loan, it was pointed out that the library community expects "free" service from the Federal libraries, but when asked for service in return, the Federal libraries are charged. A dollar charge costs at least $25 to process.

2. There is need to examine the proliferation of Federal depository library systems. If a means of consolidation could be found, states might serve as the agent for feedback in the area of local documents as they now serve as feedback for state documents.

There should be consideration of other kinds of research publications issued locally which need to have bibliographic entry into a national data base. As part of this, the research and publication program on urban problems (the 701 reports) could be deposited with the state libraries for bibliographic entry. The state libraries could then feed the information back to the Federal level.

3. There should be an examination of such programs as the Library of Congress Congressional Research Division activities as to their usefulness on a broader base, especially to state legislatures. If found useful, efforts should be made to remove Congressional restraints on publication and distribution now in force.

4. States should be alert to projects in their areas which could be fed back to the national level. An example was given in regard to a history project involving microfilming of city and county official records, private manuscripts, and the oral history element with local pioneers. The pilot project is designed to:

a. Establish standards of content and production;
b. Provide copies of microfilm, private manuscripts, and oral history tapes for deposit at state libraries;
c. Provide copies of public records on microfilm for deposit with state archives;
d. Assist the state library to provide bibliographic information to the Library of Congress and National Archives;
e. Establish a filming operators' training program to be operated by the state library and state archives.

5. The group felt recognition should be given to existing cooperative programs which are working and are very successful. These programs offer support for greater joint efforts.

Now, I'd like to take the liberty, since I couldn't enter the discussion earlier, to say that the way to gain a reversal of these policies that are traced back to the budget departments is not to look upon these departments as your enemy, but to bring them in and educate them. The decisions made on the basis of a lack of comprehension are not deliberately done to make life difficult. It's our fault if we don't get our budget officers educated to the point of understanding what our problems are and why our programs are essential. We need to understand their problems. They are supposed to be getting as much money in the coffers to help pay the bills for everything that we want to do as is feasible. Generally speaking, I've found the budget officers really understand why it is desirable that libraries get material that is produced by public agencies for dissemination back to the public. I think we need a task force to work with the Office of Management and Budget on the national level.

DISCUSSION

COMMENT: I think Maryan put her finger on it; and I think we've all been saying pretty much the same thing. If the right information can be presented to the right individuals, anything can be changed. But you've got to be able to make the case. And I think in essence we've been saying this over and over again. Andy's been saying it, specifically, that what's needed is the intellectual effort to get the information together that is going to sell the kind of program that we want to sell, to reach the goals we want to reach. The intellectual effort is hard to get because it takes talent, it takes money, and it takes leadership. And if we're talking about a task force, I think that this is one of the things a task force could do—get the talent and the resources to create the intellectual effort that is needed to accomplish all of those things we are talking about.

ELSA FREEMAN, *Dept. of Housing and Urban Development:* I want to reinforce what was just said, because it isn't only the budget people and Congressmen; there are several members of the information community who don't share some of your views. If you have facts, figures and good arguments they may be convinced.

Legislation Needed by the Research Library and Information Fields

Discussion Leader
Germaine Kretteck, American Library Association
Reporter
J. Donald Thomas, Association of College and Research Libraries

It was decided by this discussion group that the legislation needs of research libraries broke roughly into four groups:

Facilities—buildings, equipment, etc;
Resources—books, materials, etc;
Manpower—education, continuing education, training, etc.; and
Research—evaluation of what is being done, how the services are being used, and determining the value of the services.

Miss Germaine Krettek, leader of the discussion group, reviewed the Federal legislation now on the books. After considerable discussion, it was agreed that legislation presently on the books would approach adequate levels if only it were funded.

While the foregoing is a rather simplified version of the outcome of the session, the discussion was rather wide ranging.

It was pointed out that librarians needed to develop political influence, and one of the best ways to do this would be to make it understood that libraries are service agencies, and in pursuing legislative action, the push should come from libraries of all types as representatives of service agencies to the population as a whole.

Two approaches toward achieving required action were discussed. First, it was mentioned that we should write our congressmen both as private citizens and as representatives of our institutions. Secondly, we should develop areas of mutual concern with the Federal library community. In making requests for legislative action, we should support such requests with those facts which indicate that the requested actions also aid or supplement the Federal library community.

There was considerable discussion of Title II A. Funds have been shifted from the established research institutions to the developing institutions. The question then arises as to how we can secure funds for the research institution without siphoning the funds from the developing institution.

There was absolute agreement that funding was needed for both developing and research institutions, and that it was not a case of either/or. In fact, in some instances, a single institution could be classified as both a developing institution and a research institution.

The question was raised as to whether we should consider new legislation to aid major research libraries. Indeed, it was felt that the large research libraries represented national resources which could only be ignored to the detriment of the nation generally. Along these lines it was felt that perhaps some sort of legislation should be developed which would embrace four major issues: 1. creating approximately 50 "Boston-Spa" type institutions; i.e., creating national lending libraries for journals; 2. creating a national data tape clearing center; 3. underwriting Federal aid for inter-library loans; 4. providing support for specialized programs of scholarly and cultural importance such as Korean studies, and making such information and materials widely available. It was pointed out that collections of black material should be included in this type of funding.

DISCUSSION

WARREN BOES, *Syracuse University:* I'm a little concerned about the national lending library idea. What works in England, which is a slightly smaller country than this, with a smaller population, doesn't necessarily work here. I would like to see us look for regional research establishments rather than national because of our population base. I think we would give better service that way. Now I worry a little bit about this moving to just one national lending center.

THOMAS: I'd like to correct an impression which I may have given here. We really were talking, at the research level, of possible Government funding for some 50 institutions. This would not be simply one institution, but there would be a group of these networked throughout the country.

CARL JACKSON, *Pennsylvania State University:* The Federal money should be concentrated on certain specific programs and spent centrally, these programs being so planned as to benefit a wide range of institutions and readers, rather than grants of money to each of several thousand institutions.

COMMENT: I would like to point out that, as many of you know, the Library Services and Construction Act already contains a title for interlibrary cooperation, and I think this should be considered, if there is enough money in that title, and appropriated for that purpose, to accomplish many of the things that we are thinking about. It has been suggested that a lot of the resources that are now being dispersed might well be centralized into that kind of effort. At least the bare bones of the concept is already on the legislative books.

COMMENT: State plans must be built on advisory committee work, including all types of libraries that would encompass the kind of thing that would indicate 50 Boston-Spas, for example, but could also encompass regional cooperation of the type that New England is planning in which you actually will have a sharing of funds among five states.

McCARTHY: With respect to the several references to Boston Spa, I think I could say this: I'm not sure that there would be many people who would feel that the exact replica of Boston Spa, dropped on an Iowa cornfield, would be as efficient and as effective as the Boston Spa operation is. I think what many of us have in mind is the *idea* of Boston Spa, *appropriately* applied in this country with its much larger population.

Establishing Authority for National Actions and Standards

Discussion Leader
John G. Lorenz, Library of Congress
Reporter
Frank L. Schick, U.S. Office of Education

The group discussion focused on the location of authority to urge, aid and interpret legislation, appropriations, budgetary decisions, the redirection of programs, and the withholding or delay of funds by executive agencies. As cases in point, we thought particularly about Titles II-A and II-B of the Higher Education Act. The process of decision-making was traced from the Office of the President, including OMB, to Congress and the Office of Education. Then this was related to the President's and the Office of Education's national priorities. As a result of this discussion, the group reached this consensus: 1. That the library community usually lacks detailed information to react quickly and meaningfully to the decision-making; 2. That an intelligence mechanism is needed to disseminate the essentials for participation and counter-action; 3. That an expanded newsletter could supply the required data, and that increased support for the ALA Washington office may provide these necessary means of coordination with that office.

It was agreed that, to obtain action for the research library community, pressure must be applied at appropriate times on the Executive

Branch (particularly OMB), the Legislative Branch, and agencies with funding authority.

I want to insert here a personal comment about OMB, because I might be the only one who has had contact with them in the last five days. I found that the group that is in charge is young, bright, inquisitive, but by no means unfriendly or hostile. My contact was in connection with funding for statistics. The first question I got was "what's the purpose of libraries?" And after we got over that one, "what's the purpose of statistics?" These were not misleading or hostile questions. These are people who are dealing with a vast number of problems. I think there are basically five or six areas, and libraries are not one of their main concerns. But there seem to be two types of people in OMB. One is the older type that many of you know. Then there's a new group, the manager types, and exactly how they interrelate and interact I don't know. But they do seem to work in tandem. I think to omit them from any consideration would be a great mistake, because their influence is considerable. The group did discuss the difference that seems to have come about since the Bureau of the Budget became the Office of Management and Budget, and it seems that the control is greater now than it used to be under the BOB.

The following course of action seems advisable: 1. In the Executive Agencies, contact the decision makers of programs; 2. In Congress, contact the chairmen or members of committees, particularly those from the states that you come from.

Attention was paid to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. There was agreement that the Commission will make a great impact in the long run, but it will take quite a while for it to get organized and focused on specific problem areas. Research libraries will be only one of many concerns of the total library and information science community, but the Task Force also should maintain continuous contact with the Commission.

Then, the group turned to the discussion of problem areas. Here I guess I'm doing some repeating of what has been said before, but the mix here is a bit different.

Problem areas are: 1. Funding for research libraries; 2. The problem of fee versus free distribution, namely, the increasing cost of Government documents; 3. The magnetic tape problem—the increase in the number and cost; 4. The microform problem, namely, that there is a proliferation of formats, and this increases the cost for the user and for the library; 5. The distribution problem of Government documents.

All these problems led the group to the conclusion that the function of the Task Force should be as follows: 1. To bring about closer cooperation between ARL members; 2. To relate their activities to the essential contact points in the Federal Government; 3. To make the library and information science community problems more visible to the Federal Government; 4. That if the ideas are essential, and funding has not been obtained, there should be some repackaging because even OMB responds to soundly conceived programs which provide cost benefits.

There was a discussion about standardization, and there was agreement in the group that standardization in various problem areas is absolutely essential, but that ANSI, which aims at concensus of producers and consumers, is slow and sometimes not entirely satisfactory. There was a feeling that the operations of ANSI, and particularly Z-39, are as slow as they are because the funds and staff seem to remain insufficient.

There was agreement that the Task Force should provide greater visibility for the library and information science community; that it could accomplish its aims in close cooperation with the existing centers of strength, such as the ALA Washington Office, ANSI, and similar organizations; and that it should not consider itself a lobbying group.

Wanted: New Management Concepts for Inter-Library Cooperation

BERNARD M. FRY
Indiana University

Earlier sessions presented a picture of the mounting flood of new publications—amidst declining library budgets—and the far-off promise of aid from expensive new technology. Most current action in the information field was found to be uncoordinated and uncertain—often contrary, duplicative, and counterproductive. There was the implied threat that, if we do not put our house in order, there are others outside our professions waiting to do it for us.

On the basis of papers read yesterday, I have come to the conclusion that what I proposed to say about coordination and cooperation between and among research libraries and agency information services did no more than to repeat much of what was said by several speakers who assessed the past and present state of ineffectual inter-library organization and cooperation. Proposals offered for improvement, moreover, were too indirect, in my judgment, to cope with the urgency of present problems or to develop a national program of action.

What seemed to be lacking from the earlier discussions were suggestions for new or promising untried structures, capable of acting with some initiative and charged with the responsibility for developing legislation and other operative agreements and compacts to provide the necessary authority, organization, resources, and a financial base for specific national programs and priorities.

I share the belief of many that we are rapidly running out of time and resources to deal effectively with the mounting complexity and size of the information-communication problems facing us. These problems require large-scale cooperation, coordination, sharing, elimination of unnecessary duplication and overlap, infusion of new effort and funding, imaginative planning and, most of all, capacity for developing procedures leading to national programs.

The direct result of this line of thinking led me to rewrite my paper, originally entitled "Coordination Through Cooperation", and to focus mainly on the need for development of new management concepts, which I believe are essential in the coming years if we are to achieve coordinated cooperation between Federal agency information operations and the outside world of universities, professional societies, and the private sector.

Let us consider what forms of interlibrary organization and cooperation will be required by a nation-wide system for collecting and processing, and for intercommunication among resource centers and with the public. There are, of course, numerous other questions to be resolved relating to substantive matters such as functions, costs, priorities, objectives and goals; but there is no doubt that the organizational problem, while familiar, is the key to action.

I recognize the need and usefulness of committees, task groups, panels, and *ad hoc* work groups for the purpose of identification and study of problems; but it is not likely that our conventional committee structures will take us far enough toward concrete solutions or bring about actions leading to national programs.

What I am suggesting is that we give more attention to developing new management concepts and to re-examining some we already have but do not regularly use. In the latter category I am referring to library and information activities operated by consortia and by planning or operating groups, including commission type state or regional organizations. Such groups are often structured to combine elements of democratic representation with responsibility and authority to take action. In this connection I call your attention to a landmark study published by ALA on multi-jurisdictional public library systems.[1] This study reports on nearly 500 such systems in operation.

A related management concept is found in the establishment of port authorities throughout the country. Operating under a state or national charter, the port authority cuts across geographical and political boundaries and usually has statutory authority to own and operate facilities and to make charges for their use. Admittedly, operation of a port is far removed from the sensitive and complex coordination or operation of research libraries and information activities, but I venture to predict, along with some of our earlier speakers, that we are not many years away from a new national information policy. It will provide public information utilities for the storage and retrieval of information, including both research library information and a wide variety of educational material. Such utilities will undoubtedly involve computer-based networks.

Apart from such "blue-sky" forecasting, I believe many will agree that traditional committee efforts are not adequate to take information problems beyond the identification and study stage and seek their implementation. If coordinated action is needed on a broad scale, we must look to other management concepts and mechanisms.

Another—possibly appropriate—organizational or management concept suggested is the creation of a quasi-governmental unit, such as the Federal Reserve Board, which would represent the interests of both the public and private sectors. A further example can be found in the public corporation concept under which COMSAT is chartered by Federal legislation.

It does not seem likely that the new National Commission on Libraries and Information Science can fulfill the action role needed, since its responsibilities are largely advisory and promotional in nature. I do not mean at all to downgrade the National Commission; it is a promising next step resulting from a long and tedious series of studies and recommendations aimed at improved development and use of national library resources.

---

[1] Nelson Associates. ***Public Library Systems in the United States: a Survey of Multijurisdictional Systems.*** Chicago, American Library Association, 1969.

In the past, the Executive Branch has appointed a number of special panels and task groups to conduct short-term analyses and assessments of scientific and technical information problems and to recommend possible solutions. Beginning with the Baker Panel, shortly after Sputnik, there followed such studies as the Crawford Task Group, the Weinberg Panel, and the Licklider Panel. Other studies have included the SDC *Study of National Document Handling Systems* and the resulting COSATI recommendations, as well as several NSF-sponsored studies—particularly in the abstracting-indexing field—and the SATCOM report published in 1969. We should not omit, of course, the 1968 report of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries—the direct antecedent of the emerging National Commission.

I will not go on calling the roll, but I think you will agree the list of studies and committee recommendations is impressive. I believe my point, however, is obvious. We have examined and re-examined the basic problems of the library and information community, but rarely are the recommendations of these studies carried out because, for the most part, there is no effective mechanism for coordination and implementation. Beginning with the Baker Panel, and running through the later studies, there has been the implied and sometimes overt search for management concepts and procedures which will combine elements of the democratic approach—representation, voluntary cooperation, and utilization of decentralized strengths—with responsibility and authority to take action on national programs for improved utilization of information sources.

Some proposals for partial solutions, such as the "Capping Agency," the delegated agency concept, repackaging, and the wholesaler and retailer concept are too indirect to get at the heart of the problem. Similarly, the best efforts of COSATI and the Federal Library Committee fall short of getting things done unless there is total agreement.

Finally, I do not believe the proposed ARL Task Group, in union with the information community, will go far enough toward concrete solutions but will end in miniscule progress and frustration—unless the Task Group is able to come up with a new management structure or organization capable of implementing the necessary changes and providing the coordination required by nation-wide systems.

DISCUSSION

HENRY DUBESTER, *National Science Foundation:* It seems to me that Bernie Fry's address assumes the need for some overall management pattern and then demonstates that the efforts to establish such management strategy have, so far, failed. He then follows by exploring alternatives. One may well question the premise, however, with respect to the need for an overall management function. In this sense I would point out that the Weinberg recommendations have indeed been adopted, not only by several Government agencies such as the National Science Foundation, but by many of the communities and organizations addressed by these Weingerg recommendations. The central theme of the Weinberg report was that the users and the community of scientists must assume responsibility. Scientists must assume responsibility for the information function of science. The National Science Foundation has tried to implement that in the conduct of its grant programs by addressing the community rather than the operators as such. The Library of Congress has implemented specific recommendations. Many of these reports stressed, at the very outset, the pluralistic nature of the process in the society in which information develops and recognized, not only the fact of pluralism, but the strengths and virtues of that pluralism. Now, in the face of these facts, to say that we need management in order to achieve coordination raises a number of problems which should be examined rigorously and scrupulously together with the advantages of the management concept. It's not at all clear what the downstream implications are of singular management in the ambience of a pluralistic economy that involves so many different sectors of our society—not only libraries.

ELSA FREEMAN, *Department of Housing and Urban Development:* I wonder if Mr. Fry would like to elaborate on his concept of the Federal Reserve Board; this sounds to me like a very promising development in the mixture of the private and public sector, and I'd like to hear what his idea was and if he has thought further on it.

FRY: Well, I'd like to take that up in a minute, Elsa. I realized that I was exposing myself rather widely in trying to stimulate discussion and consideration of some of these management concepts; but I think that we have been going around in circles without uncovering any new approaches in many areas. I am assuming that we do have problems, and that we will have more problems in the future as networks multiply, incompatibilities are proliferated, and the mounting flood of publications increases. I don't take such a pessimistic view that chaos is here today, or will be tomorrow, but we ought to do some forward thinking about some of these matters. I have used the scientific and technical information area, and have drawn my examples from it, primarily because this has been the area of most intense and prolonged activity and, of course, the only one that has been well funded and offers such examples.

Getting back to the proposition of the Federal Reserve Board, it is possible that the new National Commission could be transmuted into that. The Federal Reserve Board is quasi-governmental to the extent that its chairman and board members are appointed by the President; however, the Federal Reserve regions are all represented and have a voice in determining the policies of the Board. It seems to me the central problem here is to preserve our strength through decentralization—the pluralistic approach, if you will—at the same time getting some order and coordination. In the past, we have not been able to get this order and coordination through studies and through voluntary cooperation—except where cooperation has been easy. Where it has been painful, we have not had cooperation. Perhaps the new National Commission will inaugurate a period quite different in the future, where cooperation through moral and intellectual persuasion will be effective, but I think that is a real question. It seems to me that we ought to keep alive and debate vigorously some alternative approaches. We do have some problems, and I don't think the threat that was repeated yesterday about outsiders coming in to take over is an empty one. We simply have to be able to cope with these problems, and not necessarily only those that are here today, but also looking forward a few years.

JOHN LORENZ, *Library of Congress:* I'd like to go back to the book on systems that you mentioned, Bernie. These were all, I believe, public library systems, and the reason they came into being was because of Federal funding under the Library Services and Construction Act. I believe that every one of those systems can be traced back to the state planning and the Federal funding that went into their creation. I think we should take a lesson from this if we expect more systems development on the statewide, regional, and national basis. Federal funding is still going to be necessary to bring them into being. I always go back to one of my favorite lines in Thornton Wilder's play, *The Matchmaker,* which was carried over into *Hello Dolly,* and which says, "Money, my friends, is like manure; it helps make young things grow." I think that this is the principal role that the Federal Government must play in the development of these systems. Along with that, I would certainly agree that you need national planning on a very high and capable level.

CARL JACKSON, *Pennsylvania State University:* This is a very interesting concept that Mr. Fry has presented for us. We will need to chew it over a great deal, I think. On first impact, I have some ambivalence. On the one hand, I don't think we need to praise pluralism too far down the line—we have a great deal of it to spare now. On the other hand, I think there is inherent in us a fear of monolithic controls. I'm thinking now in terms of freedom of information—intellectual freedom. Having just come from the Soviet Union, I'm very much aware of it. I think that this is the kind of thing we really ought to be looking at. There is a great deal of merit in casting widely beyond the traditional approach. Maybe it's the Federal Reserve Board approach, or maybe that of the Port Authority, or maybe there is some other approach. But there is much to commend the idea of reaching farther than we have, and I wish to commend Mr. Fry for his contribution.

ANDREW A. AINES, *Office of Science and Technology:* I have long memories in this field that stretch back for over ten years. I have seen many things happen, and I have seen many programs started; but one thing that strikes me as perhaps the most important of all is how all of us are being subtly reprogrammed and are beginning to look at things differently. We still have our past, and we still have the vectors that we have been following and the momentum that we have gained that will stop us very, very rapidly from pursuing the idealized view that our speaker has presented. As somebody who has tried desperately—sometimes with little success—to coordinate Federal agencies in their programs, when I think of trying to do this on a national basis, I say that we are insufficiently programmed to be willing to accept the kind of giving up of certain types of independence that we are going to have to give up. I would like to point out that the only way we are going to make progress in some kind of centrifugal action that will achieve the kind of goal that my friend, Bernie, would like to see is through a much more severe trauma than we have today. I just want you to remember that. When you begin to hurt financially to the point where you wonder how you are going to survive, the seeds of progress and the willingness to change will begin to appear. I think we are reaching that point where, intellectually, we are building a bridge where we won't have to go through all of the physical trauma to understand that these things are going to happen.

There are three magnificent reports. One is on document handling, one on abstracting and indexing, and a third on oral and formal communication. They are drawing dust; they are drawing dust because they probably are about ten years ahead of their time, and we don't have the ability, at this stage of the game, to get those people who truly hold the levers of power to understand the dilemma of the institutionalization of a process of information and information handling. The people in power still think of information as something that is of small consequence, unless they themselves need the information. I can never forget one science advisor who used to say to me, "I don't know what the problem is with you fellows in the information business; I never found any problems in getting all the information I wanted." He had a big graduate division and about 200 students who could survey the world for him on any given occasion. He could not understand the mechanics of information handling—of change, as you move from the ink print world into the electronic world. The orders of magnitude of cost and management and coordination and all the other things that are required ascend to a level way beyond anything we have experienced, and we are all still not much farther from the kind of educational experience and system that we brought into the room when we came here yesterday. Information is everybody's business—therefore, nobody's business. Until we can get that philosophy changed, I would say that the best thing we can do is to regard ourselves as being passengers on a leaky rowboat, all trying to sustain life for all of us, rather than quarreling with one another in the hope that maybe we can take away a little sustenance from the other guys so that we can survive. We all have to work together in order to accomplish this. It is indeed a pluralistic society; it is indeed a pluralistic business that we are in; it's an internationalized business. We're all parts of the machinery, and we have yet to find the intellectual qualities, the leadership qualities, that will really bring us together in the kind of magnificent simple concept that will bring us all the things we want. It's a sad thing that, given a year or so when the constant flow of money began to decrease, suddenly we all began to think the world was ending. I am inclined to believe that good times will return. We ought to be patient, we ought to work hard together, we ought to show what we are accomplishing that is worth a damn. For the most part, users in education, in science, in technology, in many places, don't have the slightest idea of the real, hard work that goes on, or the kind of contributions that this community makes. I tend to agree more with Henry Dubester's comments because he has seen, as I have, the pitifully small flow of information which comes back to us after we have asked people (and our experience is largely with the Federal agencies) to tell us what they have accomplished so that we can try to get OMB and other groups to put up more money.

We have to adapt to the new situation more rapidly, more intelligently, and more cooperatively. I would think that just simply saying we need a new organization to do this may help somewhat, but it won't be the answer.

McCARTHY: Thank you, Andy. I think what you have said is certainly true. I hope, for example, the information community will not have to sink to the level of the railroads before RAILPAX came to the rescue.

ALLAN E. ERICKSON, *Harvard University:* I would like to concur with Col. Aines' comment that the current economic situation is not without merit. Not only are we obliged to re-examine our country's policies when we are forced to consider payment for materials that we did not have to pay for before, but we're also forced to look into what opportunities already exist for cooperation that we have not taken advantage of. I think that the opportunities at the Center for Research Libraries are outstanding. Sure, you will have to pay for what you get, but what you get can be substantially more than what you would pay for the department or venture that is represented there. One other aspect of paying for what you get is the fact that libraries of private research institutions are examining their budgets and having to look at the cost of services that they provide for others. Indeed, we ourselves may get into the position of having to charge our users from the outside much as the Government decided it has to charge its users. Is it possible that, in planning for a logical approach to the support of external use, that part of the funds which might become available will be directed toward preservation activities? In such an arrangement, not only would you charge to cover the cost of servicing, but you would commit yourself to the use of a portion of those funds for preservation purposes, which I understand are not receiving adequate attention at the present time. Perhaps these two programs could be worked together in some way.

McCARTHY: With reference to that and to an earlier discussion concerning what the libraries were doing themselves, I can assure you that, at ARL meetings in the past year, there have been extended discussions on what libraries were doing internally, and what they could do among themselves and between each other. The focus of this conference, however, is not on that aspect. This is focused in a different direction, and it is for that reason that the type of economies which university libraries are adopting when they are faced with a substantial staff cut or book fund cut, is examined here only peripherally. These things have been explored—there have not been any easy answers, and the answers vary from library to library—but certainly these matters are not being ignored. If the impression is conveyed that the research libraries propose to throw up their hands and say, "Federal Government, come and rescue us," I assure you that is far from the case.

GUSTAVE HARRER, *University of Florida:* It seems to me that university libraries, mine and others, are having to look very carefully at our collecting policies. I think it's rather a good thing that we don't have all the money to buy a lot of stuff that maybe we wouldn't need; and now we're going to have to look at it much more carefully. But, on the other hand, if we do not react to what appear to be unilaterally made decisions on the part of the Federal agencies, then I don't see how we're going to make them re-examine their priorities either.

I don't want to accuse or blame people for doing certain things, but I would like to state the case strongly enough on this dissemination of information problem to make the Federal agencies re-examine their approach. They have been tooling down and saying to themselves, "We have enough money to go this far; from here on out we'll let somebody else pay the bills." Let's see if there are ways in which we can get them to stop and say, "Maybe there are ways in which we can cooperate on how and where to cut."

So I think this is a two-way street. We've got to react to one another; and I'd like to have my remarks, made earlier, interpreted in this kind of a reasonable fashion.

PHILIP J. McNIFF, *Boston Public Library:* I think there is another area of cooperation that we need to look into. It's also along the lines of what John Lorenz was saying about the various public library organizations and state library regional programs. Not only is money coming from the Federal Government for some of the areas of cooperation, but there are substantial sums of money coming from some of the states throughout the country. These are going to be geared, I think, to the total programs of information needs and services for the community. While there is very little money under Title III of the LSCA, I think this money is being supplemented by state funds, and we must not overlook this element in the total program as we move ahead.

JOHN McDONALD, *University of Connecticut:* I think I expressed some of the words out of my mouth. I did want to ask whether we should not come back to talk about John Lorenz's very practical suggestions. Do we perhaps need, in the academic sphere, an "LSCA" of our own that would promote library development? John has referred to regional cooperation twice today, and I don't think we academic librarians have picked up the intent of his thoughts. I am conscious, in New England, of the possibilities. We are a tight region, and John mentioned the five-state cooperation there. I think that this cooperation—halting as it has been at times—is still a model of sorts. The development in Ohio of the Ohio College Library Center, which is moving across state lines, is another model of sorts. I am sure that others here could present other models. Some of this I am sure is related to the very good suggestions that I think Carl Jackson made earlier, but I am impressed with the fact that the availability of funds that John alluded to is the thing that seems to have moved things forward, and perhaps that is where our future lies in academic library cooperation.

WARREN N. BOES, *Syracuse University:* In New York State we have a very active program not only in cooperation in upstate New York at Buffalo, but we also have a state sponsored program which is called the Three R's Program. It incorporates academic libraries and public libraries together in working for very positive programs. We have similar difficulties though in that, at this point, we are not adequately funded. The reason we aren't is because we have not justified ourselves as well as we ought to the community.

KATHERINE STOKES, *Office of Education:* I thought I might mention Networks for Knowledge. This never got funded. It was part of the old Higher Education Act, and I worked on the Task Force for it for a few months until we knew that it wasn't going to be funded. There were a lot of people besides librarians who wanted to hang on to that. I think that was the kind of thing that John McDonald was referring to—things that would encourage networks.

McCARTHY: Am I not right, Kitty, that, although it has never been funded, it is now the proposal of the Administration that this come under the National Foundation for Higher Education? I thought that Mr. Quie took it out of the Higher Education Act and put it in a separate bill which would provide for the establishment of the National Foundation. It includes many other things, but the concept is still there. If this bill is enacted, Networks for Knowledge might get off the ground.

Prospects as Viewed by the Sponsoring Groups

JOHN SHERROD
Chairman, COSATI Panel on Library Programs

F. KURT CYLKE
Executive Secretary, Federal Library Committee

STEPHEN A. McCARTHY
Executive Director, Association of Research Libraries

JOHN SHERROD

I think this group should realize that it is very imporant to you, and very important to the Federal bureaucrats as well, that the political processes be recognized. When the lobbyist groups on the Hill begin to support programs like the Office of Education program for more and more money, they might say just a short prayer for the national libraries because they have no one else to support them.

I noticed this morning that Steve said he had trouble identifying some of the people to write to. The Secretary of Agriculture is not a difficult man to locate in the organizational chart and probably is as easy to find as any member of Congress, including committee chairmen.

In regard to the cost trend, obviously you were upset last year; you continue to be upset this year about what appears to be a hard line Federal policy on passing a certain part of the costs of information handling on to the users. I am not going to try to rationalize that any more. I think all the arguments have been given earlier. All I can say is that I think that trend is going to continue, and it's going to get much more severe. You've seen some increase in the cost of publications. Wait until you see the costs of the new tape services the Federal agencies are coming out with. You've seen what it's going to be for the census tapes; you know what NTIS was charging for tapes; you know what the National Agricultural Library is charging for tapes. Later on this week the National Library of Medicine is going to announce the price of their tapes for MEDLARS. I don't want to give away any secrets, so I won't tell you what the price is, but I can tell you it will be significantly higher than what we have been charging for NAL tapes. I think you can look forward to more, rather than less, of this in the future.

But I do think there is something to be gained. In all of the complaints I have heard about the cost of the bibliographies, not once have I heard anyone question if the service is any better, or the product any more complete, or the quality any higher.

The fact is that, without any additional support for the programs of the national libraries, we will have to cut out ten percent of our services to stay even. You do, however, contribute to the national library through your subscriptions to the *Bibliography of Agriculture*. Without your continued support of the *Bibliography* we simply would not make a tape record of items received in the library. Also, by supporting the cost of a private production of that publication, you allow us to save those production costs in order simply to keep up with the cost of doing business.

Next year, input to that system will double. You will pay no more money; we hope it will be much faster and much better. None of the increased subscription cost comes back to the library.

I have heard these recommendations about additional task groups. I think we have enough organizations. I hope there won't be any more, but of course that will be your decision. We have established an *ad hoc* task group of COSATI and the Federal Library Committee which will include representatives of ALA and ARL (and other groups might also be included if they so desire). The task group is designed to work with the Office of Management and Budget on the question of the restructuring of the Federal Government. Any question of restructuring and the role of libraries simply has got to introduce the subject of finances—must introduce the whole subject of needs and requirements for the community, both in and outside the Government. I daresay, then, that there is very little need for another group to work with OMB.

Yesterday, Col. Aines announced that our Task Group on Library Programs had been expanded to a full COSATI Panel. With that new status, I hope, will go an expanded membership. We will be contacting library groups and information groups for additional membership names. Last year we added three new members from ACRL, and we will expect, in the future, to continue to expand and to try to make this new panel a very effective liaison mechanism between the Federal library community and the research libraries throughout the nation.

Finally, I would like very much to think that this Second Annual Conference will be the second in a long series of annual conferences, and if I were to leave you with one recommendation, it is that you vote to hold another meeting early next spring.

F. KURT CYLKE

I see three main areas and three sub-areas where the Federal Library Committee will expand its work in the next year—and hopefully after that. These areas are: communication, organization, and interface.

Marion Milczewski pointed out the lack of communication between the Federal library community and the research library community. We will try to improve this area of communication. We will add the members of the Conference to the mailing list of the *FLC Newsletter*.

I appreciate the suggestion of a need for some sort of coordinated communication tool. I won't be presumptuous and suggest what that tool will be, but I believe that, working with the COSATI Panel on Library Programs and others, we can develop such a tool.

On the matter of organization, I think it would be appropriate for you to know that Quincy Mumford of the Library of Congress initiated the concept of a work group to work with OMB, and has appointed it. The members are John Sherrod, who is the chairman, Mel Day, Ed Brunenkant, Elsa Freeman, Stanley Bougas, Steve McCarthy, Gerry Krettek, Marlene Morrisey and myself. We will use as our basic document, the Alan Rees paper which will soon be announced through NTIS.

In the area of interface, I don't see the need to create another task force. I think that the mechanisms exist. We have the COSATI Panel on Library Programs, the Federal Library Committee and the ARL represented here. In addition we have representatives of the research community and other libraries. I think that we could use this group with a subgroup structure to further our cause.

STEPHEN A. McCARTHY

This part of the program came out of a discussion on the general question of the Federal Information Resources Conference. Where does it go? What might it do or not do? What do we see ahead for it? How do we see our respective groups or organizations relating to or contributing to it? As you would expect, I will speak from the point of view of the ARL.

We have assisted one of the national libraries in its budget presentations, and I am led to believe that that was not a worthless contribution. We have, on several occasions, joined with the Library of Congress in a presentation of a portion of its program. Supporting the Library of Congress budget is a rather delicate matter because the Library of Congress is financed through the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Legislative Branch, and there is the feeling that this is within the legislative family, and outsiders had better stay out. If the Shared Cataloging Program is moved to the Library of Congress budget, we will be quite prepared to do whatever we can in the way of assisting the Library of Congress in supporting this part of its budget request.

The ARL, with the assistance of the American Association of Law Libraries and the Medical Library Association, is submitting an *amicus* brief in the Williams and Wilkins case which, as I assume you know, is a suit against the Federal Government, and particularly the National Library of Medicine, charging that the Library is guilty of infringing copyright.

The ARL has spent a great deal of money and a great deal of time preparing this *amicus* brief. We believe that all libraries have a stake in the decision in this case.

Similarly, if we can get into the appropriate channels to assist the National Agricultural Library in securing better support to undertake new programs, or to expand or strengthen existing programs, we will be glad to do so.

Yesterday, on several occasions, and again last night, a number of things were suggested and referred to the ARL as an organization that should be concerned and that might do some of the things suggested. I met with some of the officers of the Association last night, and while we did not take any definitive action, our discussions suggest that within several weeks, the ARL hopes to have committees dealing with some of the topics mentioned.

One of these is the recommendation of Bill Knox that we should be thinking ahead to the time when there will be freer access to machine readable data banks. We should be thinking in terms of guidelines and the ways in which these information stores can be used appropriately and effectively.

There is, as you know from the paper, a good deal of concern in the Congress and in some other parts of the country about the abuse of data which has been assembled by various Government agencies. If what Bill Knox foresees comes to pass, this problem will be generalized, and a whole series of decisions will have to be made. So this is one area in which we think that we may have a committee trying to inform itself and, in time, creating a statement of guidelines or principles which might prove useful.

A second area came out of Burt Adkinson's talk last evening. He stressed the importance of libraries' relating themselves effectively to data centers and information centers on campus. In some instances, it is my understanding that these data centers are either in the library or very closely affiliated with the library. In some other situations, there is a substantial distance between the library and the information center. In Burt Adkinson's view, and that of many others, these two services are closely related, and we should try to insure that they be related in the most effective manner possible.

We have good reason to expect that ARL will ask a committee to study this matter and suggest, on the basis of their findings and experience, how situations may be changed or improved. For institutions instituting a new service, the committee might suggest guidelines to be followed to insure greatest effectiveness.

There have been many references to Boston Spa, the National Lending Library, a national periodical library, etc. This subject has been discussed more or less casually within the ARL for a number of years. We are now appointing a committee which will develop the background for a proposal to study the National Lending Library idea as it might best be undertaken in this country.

We have some assurance that a good proposal can be funded. We hope to undertake a thorough study which would cover all aspects, including finance, and which would lead to a plan of action if the findings warrant it and funds are available.

I am led to believe, contrary to some of the suggestions made this morning, that the Congress would not be unreceptive to this. At a hearing before Mrs. Green's Committee last week, Congressman Dellenback raised this question. Circumstances were such that he did not get as full an answer as might have been given; however, it is true that, right now, I don't think anyone in this room would be prepared to say just what modifications or adaptations in the National Lending Library idea and program would be appropriate for this country.

This again, admittedly, will be a study, and the study might not lead to anything. But I think that none of us is prepared to present for hard-headed examination, the detailed outline of such an enterprise at the present time.

To turn to another item, there have been a number of references to inter-library loan, to freer inter-library loans, to such programs as "Three-R's" in New York State. As it happens, the ARL membership includes many of the larger research libraries of the country. These are the libraries, in most instances, which carry a very heavy burden of inter-library loan. I am excluding (and I hope my state librarian friends will excuse me) what I regard as the "wholesale" inter-library loan that is done by a state library like the New York Library. I am speaking of inter-library loans in support of research and scholarship largely as engaged in between college and university libraries, but not limited to them.

I believe it would be a fair statement to say that the directors of ARL libraries are very conscious of their responsibility in presiding over large collections, of their responsibility to make those collections perform as much service, and as useful service, as is possible. But it does cost money, and in some instances it is costing more money than the large libraries will be able to continue to provide. Again, I am not saying that the individual user should be required to pay; I am not saying that the borrowing library should be required to pay; but the cost must be recognized, and it must be paid by someone. I think there is a very real question as to whether we can expect to continue counting on the lending library to absorb the cost. That was one thing, when inter-library loan was a relatively small operation. In our large libraries, it *isn't* a small operation any more, and it costs a lot of money. When institutions are in severe financial difficulties, services such as this are sure to be scrutinized. I believe that some method by which the cost of this service can be paid must be found.

In order to have what we hope will be a good factual basis for costing this inter-library loan service, the ARL is now conducting a study of the cost of inter-library loans with assistance from the National Science Foundation. We believe that this study will establish cost figures which will stand inspection and which can be used as the basis of whatever action may be considered appropriate.

Another item which has been touched on only briefly, but to which some groups in the ARL will be asked to give attention, is the problem of support for collections that might be called "esoteric" or "exotic," but which are really national collections and which, in the judgment of some people, warrant national support.

Nobody has a program. Nobody knows how it should be done. Nobody knows that it can be justified. But some of us feel we have the obligation to try to sell this sense of national responsibility to the decision makers. We may not be successful; but I think there is reason to expect that, if the job is well done, we might be successful.

I'm old enough to remember when Ralph Dunbar left Iowa State to come to Washington to head the Library Services Division in the Office of Education. Dunbar and his successors did a tremendous selling job, or we wouldn't have the Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology today. We need more of that kind of salesmanship. The responsibility falls on all of us.

At the next meeting of the ARL we will be spending a day and a half in which, with the help of various speakers, and not excluding our own members, we will be trying to see the ARL in the context in which it proposes to function in this next decade. I trust that some clarification will come from that.

We have had from Bernie Fry, the statement that we must look more carefully at how we organize ourselves and how we manage our various enterprises in order to achieve the goals that we have before us. We, in the ARL, are doing some work in this field. Through our Office of Management Studies, which is funded by the Council on Library Resources, we are looking first at the organization, staffing, and other problems of individual research libraries. We hope that the findings from these studies will be far more broadly applicable than just to the institutions in which the studies themselves are conducted.

I come to another point where I differ with John Sherrod. I note that a year ago Jim Haas and I (Jim was then president of ARL) expressed the hope that the Federal Information Resources Conference would meet at appropriate intervals to take up our common problems. I have a feeling now that, after two meetings with an interval of a year, it is desirable, for the next year and a half, to work at some of these problems and defer our next meeting until 1973. This is not my decision, but I think there has been enough statement and restatement of problems and of points-of-view. Some hard work on these problems is now indicated.

PLENARY SESSION

MARYAN REYNOLDS, *Washington State Library:* I would like to ask the group if they all agreed with Mr. Sherrod's statement that the product that is coming out of the *Bibliography of Agriculture* is better than the previous one?

COMMENT: As one who uses it personally every day, I can talk for three hours on its defects. But I also have assurances from John Sherrod and others that, in the coming three to four or five months, it is going to be greatly improved, and so I am going to wait with bated breath. I feel that it is inadequate, but this is a qualitative judgment, and we hope that it will be improved.

HENRY DUBESTER, *National Science Foundation:* I just wanted to observe that we have listened to three speakers, and that one of the important session topics dealt with the situation, plight, and concerns of black libraries; but none of the three speakers has alluded to that portion of our Conference.

CYLKE: We stand ready in every way to respond to the needs that have been identified and to work toward a response to other needs which may be identified. We have a vehicle, through the COSATI Subcommittee on Negro Research Libraries. We are in close contact with that group, and it just did not seem necessary, at this point, to repeat that commitment.

JOHN Mc DONALD, *University of Connecticut:* I think I expressed the willingness of ARL to work with the COSATI Subcommittee on Negro Research Libraries in what I said yesterday. I do believe that part of the program was primarily under the sponsorship of this COSATI Subcommittee. I think, however, that you are quite properly reminding us of the necessity to bring it up again at this point in the plenary session.

JESSIE C. SMITH, *Fisk University:* What I have to say is on behalf of the Subcommittee on Negro Research Libraries. As secretary of the group, and as a member of it since it started last year, I would like to warn all of you that we are prepared to call your bluff. We have a long list of recommendations and needs that will require support by whatever means necessary. By that I mean whatever financial support and other support you may be able to provide. We are prepared to work through ARL or other groups to present to you our needs and our problems, and I think that we have moved beyond the point of talking. Now we need some support from you immediately. Some of us have gone to sources outside of this group for support and were not successful. Now we are goint to bring it back to you.

McCARTHY: If I interpret your statement correctly, the Subcommittee on Negro Research Libraries would welcome the appointment of an ARL committee as the initial group to work with the Subcommittee to carry forward what John McDonald said yesterday. If it is desired we will create such a committee at our Spring meeting.

BURTON LAMKIN, *Office of Education:* We have seen where a simple awareness can make a difference. If I might just mention NAL, there are a number of programs which they have started since the Subcommittee began and which are being conducted in the mode that we have been talking about. If you can, through ARL, establish a group for the Subcommittee to communicate with, they would then be able to interact with members of ARL in terms of attempting to meet some of their needs.

McCARTHY: That, as I understood the language, was what John McDonald was saying yesterday. John is presently the Vice President and next January will become the President of ARL, so I think you will be hearing from us, and we will be prepared to do what we can.

LAMKIN: If I might go on, as a silent sponsor of the Conference, I have a couple of comments to make which may or may not have some bearing on recommendations which might follow. First of all, let me add my support to some of the others that have talked. I don't believe that forming another committee to interact with the Government is going to solve any problems. Instead, we would be spending the money where it might better be spent for other, more worthwhile causes. Next, we, in the Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology, will be looking for a number of different ways to communicate with different audiences—within the Government and outside of the Government. We expect to do this through publications, through a training program, and through advisory boards. Some of this will help to remove some of the naivete that has been referred to. Some of it will also help to provide to you information on priorities within the Administration. Through this, I hope that we will be able to work together to see how these Administration priorities can be an integral part of planning for all libraries. In the Office of Education, we will be putting out announcements and letting the community know exactly what directions we are taking. At the present time, the Commissioner is formulating objectives for 1972. As soon as these are firm, they will be communicated. These aspects of the programs can be expected to be quite different from what they have been in the past, I believe. Where we can look forward to collaborative efforts, cooperative efforts—the strong helping the weak—these activities will be more strongly supported than the "shot-gun" type of activities that we have had in the past.

McCARTHY: I would now like to ask our discussion leaders if they wish to present to the Conference any resolutions, or any motions, or any proposals for action on which we might get expressions of opinion from the Conference.

DAVID HERON, *University of Kansas:* This is a resolution which emerged from the meeting of the discussion and working group which met under the chairmanship of Gustave Harrer to discuss "Priorities of the First Conference Recommendations." It reads as follows:

> To continue and advance the valuable work of the First and Second Conferences on Federal Information Resources, be it resolved:
>
> That the Association of Research Libraries, in cooperation with COSATI, the Federal Library Committee, and other interested professional organizations, establish an *ad hoc* working task group with a full time research director and staff to identify common interests and significant differences in the information community and to make recommendations to this community and to the proposed National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a national plan for library and information services.

WILLIAM LOCKE, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology:* When a suggestion like this is made, I always like to know where the money is going to come from. It sounds like about fifty thousand dollars a year. I wonder if the committee has any suggestions on how to finance it?

GUSTAVE HARRER, *University of Florida:* This was our subsequent attempt to frame, in the form of a solid motion, what seemed to be the sense of our discussion. It seemed to be one of two things that evolved as the sense of the proposals of last year. We felt that, rather than leave it just in terms of my report this morning, we should write it up in some form to propose it to you. There have been, obviously, proponents and opponents of the "Harlow Task Force" which, essentially, is what we are proposing here. It seems to me that the Conference ought to come to grips with this rather than just let it slide.

ANNETTE PHINAZEE, *North Carolina Central University:* In line with the statement and what I perceive to be the facts, I suggest that this group make a resolution that we ask the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, as its first responsibility, to do what this resolution says should be done.

DUBESTER: I would like to address some of the substance of the resolution, aligning myself, in the process, with Mrs. Phinazee. You are proposing the establishment of an *ad hoc* task force with a permanent research director. I think there may be an inherent contradiction in terms here. Further, you are proposing that, among the several missions to be assigned to this group, will be that of making recommendations with respect to a national plan. In order to do that, a planning function has to be undertaken by this *ad hoc* task force. The Commission also has the responsibility, presumably, for a national plan. I think the wording here deserves much more study.

HERON: I think Mr. Dubester got one erroneous impression from the wording of this resolution. The words *"ad hoc"* were used quite deliberately. The words, "full-time director" do not necessarily mean "permanent."

WILLIAM T. KNOX, *National Technical Information Service:* I find this proposal to be somewhat more ambitious than I think I am prepared to support. In other words, the charge to this group to come forth with a program for a national library plan seems to me to be a little ambitious. I think I agree with Mrs. Phinazee that this is the proper business of the new Commission—which won't get to it for some time. On the other hand, I see this body as being a pretty poor instrument for evolving a concrete plan. These things do need some kind of investigation by somebody; you have indicated that ARL will pick up the ball on some of them. I share the concern about the funding of the directors and the staff. What I had in mind, and what I thought Mr. Harlow had in mind, was a small group of wise men who would sit down at a table and come up with some new ideas, and I would like to see these passed along to the new Commission. I just wondered whether anyone else shared my concern.

LLOYD WAGNER, *Catholic University:* I think it might be recognized that the ground work already exists for very much of what you have spoken of here in the resolution. The Federal Library Committee, COSATI, and ARL are in constant touch among themselves concerning matters that were discussed here and that exist in this city. Consequently, we have a good part of this resolution already in effect. Such a resolution could be worded so that these same people could direct their attention to these problems.

MYLES SLATIN, *State University of New York at Buffalo:* I wonder if another function of this task force should be to act as a continuing agent for this Conference to help to plan for the next meeting (which might be next year, or a year and a half, or two years away) and also to help to continue the work that has been started in the discussion groups by trying to cover the wide range of problems and solutions—considering them, sifting them out, and feeding them to the National Commission and to the other agencies involved.

MARION MILCZEWSKI, *University of Washington:* I suggest that the Association of Research Libraries, its staff and its board consider what action should be taken to implement some of the recommendations of this Conference. What I am proposing, therefore, is not another body, necessarily. The ARL may, indeed, in consultation with COSATI and the Federal Library Committee, decide finally that that should happen; but I think we are too divided at this point.

HERON: I think I ought to withdraw the original motion. But first, Mrs. Phinazee's earlier remarks worried me a little because I am not certain that, considering our particular interests, we are prepared right now, at the end of this meeting, to convey to the National Commission a message which would be useful.

McCARTHY: Mr. Heron has withdrawn his resolution.

MILCZEWSKI: This puts the responsibility on ARL.

I move that the Executive Director and his staff and the Board of the Association of Research Libraries, in consultation with the COSATI Panel on Library Programs, the Federal Library Committee and such other bodies as they believe appropriate, consider what action ought to be taken to implement the recommendations and the considerations that were expressed at this Second Conference on Federal Information Resources.

In effect, this places the burden on the staff and the Board of ARL to get us out of what appears to be an impasse.

McCARTHY: Are there any other questions or comments on the resolution which Mr. Milczewski has just presented?

GRIEG ASPNES, *Cargill Inc. Research Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota:* I only rise to speak because, as it has been mentioned before, there are probably only three of us representing private industry and the Special Libraries Association. This may be a viewpoint which you should consider in the charge to ARL's committee. I agree with it and, as a member of the first discussion group, I did have the feeling of a minority report, because we discussed so much of the national plan of libraries. I thought this was far beyond the bounds of the Conference which I thought was simply on the subject of Federal information resources. So I would suggest that, in addition to the motion before the house, a specific charge should be made to take one or a few small bits of problems and tangle with them rather than become too broad and too diffuse. I would suggest that much of the sense of the discussion of the past day and a half (although it has gone very wide—into national networks and everything else) was to define what is the responsibility of the Federal information resources agencies toward the research library or information community. I think that this should be restressed, and that we should attempt to find out what the responsibilities of these agencies are (those which are collecting or producing information) in making this information available to the people who can use it. I mean not only availability in terms of documents. I think there is much to be said for the fact that the documents themselves should be paid for. I am talking more about availability in terms of indexing—indexes, bibliographies, lists, etc. If the Patent Office had no bulletin, how would we know what's in the Patent Office? If the Clearinghouse had no *USGRDR Index*, how would we know what exists there? My greatest complaint about the *Bibliography of Agriculture* is that now we do not know what is in that great storehouse of information except through what I call a very inadequate index at the moment. So, I say, let's tackle a small project, or a series of small projects, and one might be to determine how we might help the agencies, each one of which will be unique and individual, define their responsibilities and how they see the responsibility to the users of this information.

McCARTHY: Would I be understanding your position correctly, Mr. Aspnes, if we regarded this as advice to the group to which Mr. Milcewski's resolution was addressed?

ASPNES: I'm thinking of specifying in the original statement that we should take a small project or a series of small projects . . .

HARRER: I have a motion which addresses itself to that—

QUESTION: I wonder if Mr. Milczewski intends to include Mr. Harlow's recommendations as recommendations of this conference? I assume this is the case, and I hope so.

MILCZEWSKI: I mean to include only those recommendations which will be voiced here, and the ARL group may decide to go back into the documentation of the Conference to pick up some other things. That is why I used the word, "considerations;" because I don't know what the specific recommendations will be.

> NOTE: A second to the resolution was offered by Miss Maryan Reynolds, Washington State Library. The vote was taken and passed without opposition.

GUSTAVE HARRER, *University of Florida:* To phrase our second concern into the form of a motion, perhaps less contentious than the way we phrased the first one, we hope that its wording includes both sides of the argument that it represents.

Be it resolved: that all libraries which make use of Federal information resources should communicate to the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government their concern about the recent decision to decentralize the cost of information dissemination and should work with these agencies to develop a basis of fact upon which arguments for appropriate funding for this purpose can rest.

> NOTE: A second to the resolution was offered by Myles Slatin, State University of New York at Buffalo. The vote was taken and passed with one dissenting vote.

WARREN J. HAAS, *Columbia University Library:* Two resolutions resulted from the discussions of the second working group on the "Most Essential Common Needs of Research and Federal Libraries." The first has two elements and is phrased as follows:

> Resolved: that this Conference refer to the Association of Research Libraries for appropriate action, two proposals of the second working group, addressed specifically to ARL:
>
> 1. that the Association take the initiative to find appropriate ways of working with smaller colleges and black research libraries in the preparation of proposals; and
> 2. to urge member libraries of the Association, individually and collectively, to work in their states to develop and encourage the support of systems that extend access to resources.
>
> NOTE: A second to the motion was offered by a member of the Conference. The vote was taken and passed without opposition.

HAAS: The second resolution reads as follows:

> Resolved: that the needs identified by the second working group be formally entered into the proceedings of this Conference for the attention of and appropriate action by the sponsoring groups and agencies.

In further explanation of this resolution, let me say that, this morning I reported a checklist of eight specific kinds of action that the members of the second working group identified as being fundamental and important if research libraries are to move into the future. I reported on the need to set standards for the whole complex of bibliographic information in a machine-based information system; on the need to rationalize the process of automation; on the need to identify and record the role of the distinctive research libraries as national resources; and that entire list of things that was reported from the second working group.

The objective of this resolution, then, is simply to get these items formally entered into the proceedings so that they become items for action and attention for the sponsoring groups and others who may be in a position to do something.

DUBESTER: I think the purpose of the motion is warranted; however, it does raise the problem that has been discussed before. These are very wide-ranging and general needs that are being descirbed. They are being addressed in the ambience of a conference of Federal libraries seeking to find their relationship with and to secure feedback from non-Federal libraries and to devise courses of action within this Federal/non-Federal library community. The purpose of the Milczewski resolution to have ARL consider these recommendations and propose some action is part of the overall objective here of seeing that some action will be taken. I believe if the intent of that earlier motion is joined with the intent of this—to get general recommendations recorded for action—then you will have a base for the next step. As it is you have recommendations which could very well have emanated from a panel of ALA, or ARL, or any other scene where librarians get together. It has to be something much more specific, I believe.

> NOTE: A discussion followed during which the Conference was assured that the published proceedings would contain the recommendations and findings of the five working groups. On the basis of this, the second resolution offered by Mr. Haas was withdrawn.

McCARTHY: I would like to ask this question: I am not clear on whether the Milczewski resolution is intended to cover the recommendation of the Harlow paper.

MILCZEWSKI: My intention was to include the recommendations which came out of the discussion and working groups.

McCARTHY: The basic recommendation of the Harlow paper was that an effort should be made to bring together the various segments of the information community to try to look at the problem as a whole. Now I don't believe that any of the discussion groups dealt specifically with that question.

REYNOLDS: To me, Marion Milczewski's resolution is asking that this portion of the Harlow recommendation be assigned now to ARL Staff and Board in consultation with Federal library groups.

McCARTHY: Is that the general feeling?

MILCZEWSKI: It might turn out, as a result of the discussions which ARL has with these various groups, that such a task group might be formed, but that there might be an alternative, even better, which could result from these discussions.

McCARTHY: All right, if that covers it, we can turn to whatever else engages your interest and attention.

> NOTE: The question was raised as to when the Conference should be held again. The ensuing discussion was summarized by the Conference Chairman, Dr. McCarthy.

McCARTHY: The sponsoring agencies, COSATI, Federal Library Committee, Office of Education, and Association of Research Libraries, will reach a decision in due course as to when it seems desirable to have another meeting of this group.

List of Registered Attendees

Aines, Andrew A., Office of Science and Technology
Adkinson, Burton, American Geographical Society
Anderson, Charlotte L., Deere & Company
Anderson, LeMoine W., Colorado State University
Aspnes, Grieg, Cargill, Inc.
Axford, H. William, Arizona State University
Baatz, Wilmer H., Indiana University
Berry, Paul L., Library of Congress
Berthel, John H., Johns Hopkins University
Bland, Catherine V., Virginia State College
Boes, Warren N., Syracuse University
Bougas, Stanley J., Dept. of Commerce
Boylan, Merle N., Jr., University of Massachusetts
Bright, Lewis M., State Department
Brock, Clifton, University of North Carolina
Bronson, Barbara, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Ga.
Brunenkant, Edward J., Atomic Energy Commission
Buckman, Thomas R., Northwestern University
Budington, Wm. S., John Crerar Library
Burchinal, Lee G., U.S. Office of Education
Caponio, Joseph F., Nat'l. Agricultural Library
Carter, Faye T., Lincoln University
Cartwright, Phyllis B., Florida Atlantic University
Chiu, Kai-Yun, Johns Hopkins University
Churchwell, Charles D., Miami University
Cole, Fred, Council on Library Resources
Conley, Binford H., Alabama A. and M.
Costabile, Salvatore, Nat'l. Library of Medicine
Cummings, Martin M., Nat'l. Library of Medicine
Cylke, Frank Kurt, Federal Library Committee
Daniel, Lois H., Tennessee State University
Davis, Hillis D., Cooperative College Library Center, Inc.
De Prospo, Ernest, Rutgers University
Dix, William S., Princeton University
Dougherty, Richard M., Syracuse University
Draz, Peter, Time, Inc.
Droze, Wilmon N., Tennessee State Library-Archive
Dubester, Henry J., Nat'l. Science Foundation
Durkin, Robert E., Federal City College
Dyke, James, New Mexico State University
Edmonds, Anne C., Mount Holyoke College
Engley, Donald B., Trinity College
Erickson, Allan E., Harvard University
Estes, Sarah, West Virginia Library Commission
Farley, Richard A., Kansas State University
Farmakides, John B., Nat'l. Science Foundation

Fern, Lois, U.S. Information Agency
Fockler, Herbert H., Federal Library Committee
Frantz, Ray, University of Virginia
Freeman, Elsa S., Dept. of Housing & Urban Development
Fry, Bernard, Indiana University
Gaines, Abner J., University of Rhode Island
Gartland, Henry J., Veterans Administration
Gordon-Gourlay, J. W., Clemson University
Govan, James F., Swarthmore College
Grayson, Lawrence P., U.S. Office of Education
Greenbie, Barrie B., University of Massachusetts
Greenwood, Walter B., Navy Dept. Library
Haas, Warren J., Columbia University
Haggerty, Thomas M., Dept. of Commerce
Hamer, Elizabeth E., Library of Congress
Hamrick, Lillian A., Department of Labor
Harlow, Neal, Rutgers University
Harrer, Gustave A., University of Florida
Henderson, Madeline, Nat'l. Bureau Standards
Heron, David, University of Kansas
Hilton, Howard J., Pennsylvania State University
Hopp, Ralph H., University of Minnesota
Huffer, Mary A., Smithsonian Institution
Jackson, Carl W., Pennsylvania State University
Janaske, Paul C., U.S. Office of Education
Jeffs, Joseph E., Georgetown University
Johnson, Carol, Nat'l. Agricultural Library
Johnson, Richard D., The Claremont Colleges
Johnson, Robert K., University of Arizona
Jonah, David A., Brown University
Jones, James V., Case Western Reserve University
Jordan, Robert T., Federal City College
Kaser, David, Cornell University
Kaufman, Dorothy W., Bureau of Census
Kauffman, Bruce R., University of Cincinnati
Kee, Walter A., Atomic Energy Commission
Keenan, Stella, Nat'l. Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Service
Kellam, W. Porter, University of Georgia
Kennedy, Eugene P., St. Louis University
King, Annie G., Tuskegee Institute
Klassen, Robert, U.S. Office of Education
Knox, James, Stanford University
Krettek, Germaine, American Library Association
Lamkin, Burton E., U.S. Office of Education
Lane, Robert, Air University Library
Lee, William M., University of Kentucky
Leiter, Joseph, Nat'l. Library of Medicine
Littleton, Isaac T., North Carolina State University
Locke, William N., Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Lorenz, John G., Library of Congress
Losee, Madeleine W., National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Lybeck, Pauline, Science Associates/International, Inc.
Lynch, Isabell, Maryland Div. of Library Development
McCarthy, Stephen A., Association of Research Libraries
McDonald, John P., University of Connecticut
McDonough, Roger H., New Jersey State Library
McFarland, Marvin W., Library of Congress
McMullan, J. N., Louisiana State University
McNiff, Philip J., Boston Public Library
Martin, Louis E., Association of Research Libraries
Meadow, Charles T., Office of Science & Technology
Milczewski, Marion A., University of Washington
Miller, Elizabeth, Urban Institute
Mohrhardt, Foster E., Council on Library Resources
Morrisey, Marlene D., Library of Congress
Mothershed, S. W., Texas Southern University
Murray, Barbara R., National Cancer Institute
Ogilvie, Philip S., North Carolina State Library
Olsen, James L., Jr., Nat'l. Academy of Sciences
Olsen, Wallace C., Nat'l. Agricultural Library
Orne, Jerrold, University of North Carolina
Painter, Ann F., Drexel University
Papier, Lawrence, U.S. Office of Education
Paulson, Peter, N.Y. State Education Department
Payne, Kirby B., Department of Transportation
Perry, Pennie, North Carolina Central University
Phinazee, Annette, North Carolina Central University
Powell, Benjamin E., Duke University
Pretzer, Dale H., Michigan Dept. of Education Bureau of Library Services
Puffer, Nathaniel H., University of Delaware
Reason, Joseph H., Howard University
Regulus, Homie, Fort Valley State College
Reynolds, Maryan E., Washington State Library
Rogers, Rudy D., Yale University
Rogofsky, Murray, Naval Oceanographic Office
Rosenthal, Elaine, Department of Interior
Rouse, Roscoe, Oklahoma State University
Rudolph, G. A., Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Rovelstad, Howard, University of Maryland
Sauter, Hubert E., National Technical Information Service
Schafer, June A., Chemical Handling and Information Section, WRAIR
Schick, Frank L., U.S. Office of Education
Schwass, Earl R., Naval War College
Shank, Russell, Smithsonian Institution
Sherrod, John, Nat'l. Agricultural Library
Shipman, Joseph C., Linda Hall Library
Simonton, Wesley C., University of Minnesota
Slater, Francis L., University of Pittsburgh
Slatin, Miles, State University of New York
Smith, G. Donald, Washington State Univ.
Smith, J. I., ERIC Clearinghouse for Library and Information Science

Smith, Jessie Carney, Fisk University
Smith, John B., Texas A & M University
Smith, Patricia, U.S. Office of Education
Smith, Peggy, Nebraska Public Library Commission
Smith, Ruth S., Institute for Defense Analysis
Songe, Alice, Department of Health, Education and Welfare
South, Jean-Anne, U.S. Office of Education
Sprow, Allen J., Veterans Administration
Stevens, Charles H., Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Stokes, Katherine M., U.S. Office of Education
Taylor, Nettie B., Maryland State Department of Education
Thomas, J. D., Association of College and Research Libraries
Trezza, Al, Illinois State Library
Urban, Bernard, Department of Housing and Urban Development
Vassallo, Paul, Library of Congress
Vincent, Donald E., University of New Hampshire
Wagner, Lloyd F., Catholic University of America
Waters, Samuel T., Nat'l. Agricultural Library
Webber, John P., National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Welch, William J., Library of Congress
White, Lucien W., University of Illinois
Williams, Gordon R., Center for Research Libraries
Winnacker, R. A., Office of the Secretary of Defense
Wise, Edith C., New York University
Woods, W. Matt, Federal City College
Yates, Virginia H., Joint Continental Defense Systems Integration Planning Staff
Zenich, Margaret B., STINFO Division, Department of the Army